

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AUDLEY BARRINGTON LYON, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS
ENFORCEMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [13-cv-05878-EMC](#)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS’
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT; AND DENYING
PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Docket Nos. 120, 139

I. INTRODUCTION

The instant action is brought on behalf of a certified class of adult immigration detainees who are or will be held by Defendant United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) in Contra Costa County, Kern County, Sacramento County, or Yuba County. Docket No. 99 (First Supplemental Complaint) (Compl.) at ¶ 90.

The Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) grants the Attorney General the discretionary authority, transferred to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), to detain any alien in removal proceedings pending a final order. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). At issue are conditions at four detention facilities used to hold adult immigration detainees: Yuba County Jail (Yuba), Rio Cosumnes Correctional Center (RCCC) in Sacramento County, West County Detention Facility (Contra Costa), and Mesa Verde Detention Facility (Mesa Verde) in Bakersfield County (collectively, Facilities). See FAC at ¶¶ 31-32. Plaintiffs’ cases are venued at the San Francisco Immigration Court; thus, Contra Costa, RCCC, Yuba, and Mesa Verde are respectively 21, 83, 123, and 282 driving miles from San Francisco. See Docket No. 100 (Answer) at ¶ 33. Because of this distance, Plaintiffs allege that in-person visits are “impractical at best,” making telephone

1 access “critical to Plaintiffs’ ability to locate, retain, and seek advice from legal counsel” and
2 “essential to gather the evidence and government documents necessary to defend[] against
3 removal charges, locate witnesses, and do other things necessary to represent themselves in
4 complex legal proceedings.”¹ FAC at ¶ 3.

5 However, because of restrictions on telephone access, Plaintiffs contend that they are
6 unable to retain or communicate with counsel, or to gather evidence to be presented in removal
7 proceedings or that is otherwise necessary for relief. *Id.* at ¶ 6. Plaintiffs specifically allege the
8 following limitations: (1) high rates and fees for paid calls from Housing Unit Phones; (2)
9 technical barriers and payment restrictions on Housing Unit Phones, such as a “positive
10 acceptance” requirement where the individual being called must accept the call; (3) inadequacies
11 of the free call or pro bono platforms; (4) limits on hours of telephone access; (5) lack of privacy;
12 (6) inability to receive incoming calls or timely messages; and (7) failure to provide notice of
13 calling options for detainees with limited English or Spanish language skills. Plaintiffs Mot. at 6.
14 As a result of these alleged restrictions, Plaintiffs who would be eligible for relief are deported or
15 unnecessarily detained as they seek continuances in order to find counsel and gather evidence.
16 Compl. at ¶¶ 5, 6.

17 Based on these allegations, Plaintiffs bring three claims for relief: (1) the right to
18 representation of counsel, (2) the right to a full and fair hearing, and (3) the right to petition the
19 government for redress of grievances. *Id.* at ¶¶ 100-112. The Court certified a class of “all current
20 and future immigration detainees who are or will be held by ICE in Contra Costa, Sacramento, and
21 Yuba Counties” in April 2014 under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2), and expanded the
22 class definition to include detainees who are or will be held in Bakersfield County. *See* Docket
23

24 ¹ For example, detainees seeking asylum or withholding or deferral of removal under the United
25 Nations Convention Against Torture often must gather evidence of their identity, conditions in
26 their home country, and other evidence corroborating their claim. *See* Docket No. 120-19
27 (Realmuto Dec.) at ¶ 28. Similarly, detainees seeking cancellation of removal need to establish
28 residency and physical presence, the absence of disqualifying criminal convictions, good moral
character, and/or hardship to a qualifying relative. *Id.* Finally, detainees who seek a U-visa must
obtain a government-issued form certifying that the individual was a victim of a crime and that the
individual was helpful to law enforcement. *See* Docket No. 120-22 (Prasad Dec.) at ¶ 16.

1 Nos. 31, 98.

2 The parties' cross-motions for summary judgment came on for hearing before the Court on
3 February 11, 2016. *See* Docket Nos. 120 (Plaintiffs Mot.), 139 (Defendants Mot.). For the
4 reasons set forth below, the Court **GRANTS** in part and **DENIES** in part Defendants' motion for
5 summary judgment, and **DENIES** Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment.

6 **II. BACKGROUND**²

7 A. Undisputed Facts

8 The Court finds that the following facts are not in dispute.

9 1. General Matters

10 1. Many of the detainees were arrested for a crime or are being held by the
11 ICE after serving time for their crimes. *See* Docket No. 139-2 (Shinners Dec.), Exh. 1 (Vaughn
12 Dep.) at 175:25-176:4.

13 2. Of the individuals held between December 10, 2012 through August 31,
14 2014, 10.54% were classified low risk, 20.5% were medium-low risk, 35.7% were medium-high
15 risk, and 33.27% were high risk.³ *Shinners Dec.*, Exh. 32.

16 3. Each of the Facilities provide access to telephones in or near the common
17 areas of their housing units (Housing Unit Phones). *See* Docket No. 119-5, Exh. A (Berg Report)
18 at 6-11.

19 4. Since this action was filed, ICE also began offering access to telephones
20 outside of the housing units at Yuba, Contra Costa, and Mesa Verde. *Id.* at 12-15.

21 5. Detainees at all four facilities also have access to a "Free Call Platform" or
22 "Pro Bono Platform" from the Housing Unit Phones and some Phone Rooms, which allows free
23 direct calls to a pre-programmed set of speed dial numbers. *See* *Shinners Dec.*, Exh. 6 (Landy

24 _____
25 ² Defendants make a number of evidentiary objections to the declarations submitted by Plaintiffs
26 in support of their motion for summary judgment. Docket No. 139-1. Many of these objections
27 have merit, and the Court will sustain the objections. However, the objected to statements have no
28 impact on the Court's ruling on the cross-motions for summary judgment.

³ Risk takes into account factors such as flight risk, protective custody factors (*i.e.*, age), and the
seriousness or violent nature of criminal convictions. *Vaughn Dep.* at 199:5-19.

1 Dep.) at 159:16-20.

2 6. Detainees may also request to be transported to the ICE Field Office to
3 make telephone calls.⁴ *See* Shinners Dec., Exh. 31 (Butler Dep.) at 87:13-22. Detainees at all
4 facilities also have access to legal mail and attorney visits, although there is some evidence that
5 these services are inadequate substitutes for telephone access due to the delay in responses and
6 distance between the Facilities and where attorneys are located. *See* Docket No. 120-17 (Supp.
7 Vincent Dec.) at ¶ 11.

8 2. Contra Costa

9 7. Contra Costa is an open, campus-style facility. Shinners Dec., Exh. 20
10 (Bonthron Dep.) at 45:19. Because of this open layout, Contra Costa only houses detainees who
11 fall into certain security classifications, and does not house any ICE detainees classified as high
12 risk, have accumulated a significant number of disciplinary incident reports, have medical or
13 mental health needs, or have been violent against other inmates or staff. *Id.* at 45:18-46:14;
14 118:18-22.

15 8. Housing Unit Phones are located in dayrooms on each tier of the housing
16 units. Berg Report at 6. They are typically set up in pairs facing each other, and are often located
17 only a few feet from the door of the nearest cell. *Id.* The Housing Unit Phones are also located
18 within auditory range of the common-area tables and televisions. *Id.*; *see also* Docket No. 124-5
19 (Takei Dec.) at DSC00452, 484, 504, 535. All Housing Unit Phone calls are monitored and
20 recorded. Berg Report at 7.

21 9. In order to use the Housing Unit Phone, detainees must pay an initiation fee
22 of \$2.60-\$3.00, and per-minute rates ranging from \$.05-\$.025. Docket No. 119-10 (Phillips Dec.),
23 Exh T.

24
25 _____
26 ⁴ This process requires being shackled, and is considered insufficient to comply with ICE
27 detention standards that require telephone access within the detention facility. *See* Docket No.
28 144-1 (Yee-Garcia Dec.), Exh. 49 (Meyer Dep.) at 132:2-14 (testifying that transportation requires
shackles on the hands and a chain around the waist); Exh. 50 (Dozoretz Dep.) at 124:16-126:1
(explaining that detention standards are facility-specific, and that if the facility lacks accessible
phones which provide privacy for detainees to discuss legal matters, it will be cited as deficient).

1 10. Housing Unit Phone calls must be paid for by the recipient. Ha Dec., Exh.
2 35 (Bonthon Dep.) at 165:20-25. Thus, detainees can only call individuals or offices that agree to
3 accept collect calls or have a prepaid account. Berg Report at 7.

4 11. Housing Unit Phones have a positive acceptance requirement; the phone
5 plays an outgoing message identifying the caller as an “inmate” calling from Contra Costa jail,
6 before prompting the call recipient to affirmatively accept the call by pressing a numbered key on
7 his or her phone. See Ha Dec., Exh. 36 (Neria-Garcia Dep.) at 169:22-24; Ha Dec., Exh. 35
8 (Bonthon Dep.) at 167:8-21.

9 12. The positive acceptance requirement makes it impossible for detainees to
10 navigate automated telephone systems to dial an extension or leave a voicemail message. Ha
11 Dec., Exh. 35 (Bonthon Dep.) at 167:22-168:4 (explaining that calls which go to voice mail or
12 offices that use a phone tree system will not connect); Berg Report at 7-8, 10.

13 13. Detainees are not permitted to make three-way calls.⁵ Ha Dec., Exh. 31
14 (Philbin Dep.) at 85:9-11 (“Q: So is it your understanding that all facilities do not allow three-way
15 calls? A: That is my understanding.”); Phillips Dec., Exh. D (Contra Costa Detainee Handbook) at
16 14.

17 14. Detainees are only permitted to use the Housing Unit Phones during
18 designated free time hours. Ha Dec., Exh. 35 (Bonthon Dep.) at 38:1-13. Free time hours are
19 limited to Monday through Wednesday and Friday between 3:30 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. and 6:30 p.m.
20 to 9:00 p.m., Thursday between 6:30 p.m. and 9:00 p.m., and Saturday and Sunday between 10:30
21 a.m. and 11:30 a.m., 1:30 p.m. to 2:50 p.m., 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., to 6:45 p.m. and 10:00 p.m.
22 Ha Dec., Exh. 35 (Bonthon Dep.) at 60:1-8.

23 15. From the Housing Unit Phones, detainees can access the Talton Free Call
24 Platform, which allows direct calls to a limited set of speed-dial numbers, made up primarily of
25 federal government offices connected with immigration, the immigration court system, foreign

26 _____
27 ⁵ Three-way calls are used by attorneys to communicate with detainees who do not share a
28 common language by including an interpreter. See Phillips Dec., Exh. Q (Shugall Dep.) at 96:23-
97:11.

1 consulates, and several free legal services providers. Berg Report at 6; *see also* Takei Dec. at
2 DSC00434, 555. The free call numbers do not include local government offices or local courts.
3 *See* Takei Dec. at DSC00434, 555. The free legal service providers also do not include all offices
4 on Defendants’ free legal services list. *Compare id.* with Ha Dec., Exh. 9.

5 16. The Talton Free Call Platform has a 15-minute automatic cutoff. Contra
6 Costa officials were unable to explain why there is a cutoff. Ha Dec., Exh. 37 (Grant Dep.) at
7 77:4-18 (stating that she does not know why there is an automatic cutoff and when compared with
8 other telephone calls, “there’s no comparison” and “[i]t doesn’t make any sense to me.”).

9 17. In addition to the Housing Unit Phones, Contra Costa has -- following the
10 filing of this suit -- added phone rooms, from which detainees are permitted to make private and
11 free calls to case-related contacts. Ha Dec., Exh. 37 (Grant Dep.) at 64:9-15.

12 18. Contra Costa maintains a dedicated e-mail address for attorney e-mail
13 messages, while anyone may send e-mail messages through its SmartMail service. Shinners Dec.,
14 Exh. 23 at 5; Grant Dep. at 88:15-89:9.

15 19. Information about the dedicated attorney e-mail system is posted on the
16 housing units to advise detainees that the system is available. Shinners Dec., Exh. 20 (Bontron
17 Dep.) at 208:14-18.

18 20. The attorney e-mail system is not confidential; two copies of the e-mail are
19 printed out, with one being logged and the other hand-delivered to the detainee. *Id.* at 208:7-12;
20 Supp. Vincent Dec. at ¶ 10.⁶

21 3. RCCC

22 21. RCCC houses only male detainees in dormitory-style housing units that
23 contain phones the detainees can access at any time.⁷ Shinners Dec., Exh. 31 (Butler Dep.) at
24

25 ⁶ It is unclear how quickly messages are passed onto the detainees; one attorney stated that she
26 would message her clients to call her, but would not receive a call back for several days. Supp.
27 Vincent Dec. at ¶ 10. However, she was unsure if the waiting period was due to phone
28 availability, a delay in clients receiving messages, or both. *Id.*

⁷ For detainees held in administrative segregation, there is a dispute over how many hours a day
these detainees would have access to phones. *See* Ha Dec., Exh. 32 (Butler Dep.) at 63:22-64:25
(stating that they have access “several hours a day”); Docket No. 120-8 (M.G. Dec.) at ¶ 6 (stating

1 32:12-14, 41:2.

2 22. The Housing Unit Phones are located within auditory range of the
3 stairwells, and below a television which is kept at a loud volume. Berg Report at 7-8; *see also*
4 Takei Dec. at DSC00329, 290.

5 23. All Housing Unit Phone calls are monitored and recorded. Berg Report at
6 8.

7 24. In order to use the Housing Unit Phones, detainees must pay an initiation
8 fee of \$1.75 to \$2.40, and per-minute rates ranging from \$.175-\$.50. Phillips Dec., Exh. B at 52.
9 Phone calls are limited to 20 minutes. Ha Dec., Exh. 32 (Butler Dep.) at 81:17-18.

10 25. Like Housing Unit Phones at Contra Costa, Housing Unit Phones at RCCC
11 have a positive acceptance requirement, with the phone playing an outgoing message identifying
12 the caller as a "Sacramento County inmate." Ha Dec., Exh. 32 (Butler Dep.) at 118:3. The
13 recipient must then accept the call. Ha Dec., Exh. 32 (Butler Dep.) at 118:15-16.

14 26. Detainees are not permitted to make three-way calls. Ha Dec., Exh. 31
15 (Philbin Dep.) at 85:9-11.

16 27. From the Housing Unit Phones, detainees can access the Talton Free Call
17 Platform. Berg Report at 6; *see also* Takei Dec. at DSC00356. The free call numbers do not
18 include local government offices or local courts, and do not include all offices on Defendants' free
19 legal services list. *Compare id.* with Ha Dec., Exh. 9.

20 28. The instructions for using the Talton Free Call Platform are confusing and
21 incorrect. Berg Report at 8.

22 29. Unlike the other Facilities, RCCC does not offer a dedicated phone room
23 for private calls. Instead, RCCC permits detainees to make phone calls from a private phone in
24 the law library. Shinnars Dec., Exh. 31 (Butler Dep.) at 37:16-38:1.

25 30. The library phone is free, has no time limit and does not require positive
26

27
28 that while in restricted housing, he was only let out of his cell one hour a day, during which he had
access to showers and telephone calls).

1 acceptance. *See* Shinners Dec., Exh. 31 (Butler Dep.) at 81:18-20.

2 31. Like Contra Costa, there is an e-mail system for people to communicate
3 with a detainee. Shinners Dec., Exh. 31 (Butler Dep.) at 92:4-10. Each day, the e-mail is pulled
4 off the server and delivered by the night shift to the deputies to be passed out to the detainees.
5 Shinners Dec., Exh. 31 (Butler Dep.) at 92:11-15. The night shift and deputies are permitted to
6 read these messages. Shinners Dec., Exh. 31 (Butler Dep.) at 92:16-23.

7 4. Yuba

8 32. Yuba provides a mix of housing styles; depending on the housing style,
9 detainees have varying degrees of access to the housing unit phones. Shinners Dec., Exh. 27 (Gil
10 Dep.) at 22:9-23:11. Individuals who are in an administrative segregation tank (individual cells)
11 have access to phones for one hour a day. *Id.* at 22:9-15. Other units with single cells permit
12 access for four hours a day. *Id.* at 22:16-21. Individuals held in dorm style settings have access to
13 phones at all times. *Id.* at 22:21-25.

14 33. All Housing Unit Phone calls can be monitored and recorded, although such
15 calls are not routinely monitored. *Id.* at 67:15-19.

16 34. In order to use the Housing Unit Phones, detainees must pay an initiation
17 fee of \$3.20, and per-minute rates ranging from \$.06-\$330. *See* Ha Dec., Exh. 43.

18 35. Phone calls are limited to twenty minutes. Ha Dec., Exh. 27 (Vaughn Dep.)
19 at 116:6-9.

20 36. Like Housing Unit Phones at other facilities, the Housing Unit Phones at
21 Yuba have a positive acceptance requirement, with the phone playing an outgoing message
22 identifying the caller as an “inmate at the Yuba County Jail.” Berg Report at 10. The recipient
23 must then accept the call. *Id.*

24 37. Detainees are also not permitted to make three-way calls. Ha Dec., Exh. 31
25 (Philbin Dep.) at 85:9-11.

26 38. From the Housing Unit Phones, detainees can access the Talton Free Call
27 Platform. Berg Report at 9; *see also* Takei Dec., at DSC00129, 148, 188, 253, 254. The free call
28 numbers do not include local government offices or local courts, and do not include all offices on

1 Defendants' free legal services list. *Compare* Takei Dec. at DSC00129, 188 with Ha Dec., Exh. 9.

2 39. Yuba provides a phone room that contains two phones for detainees to
3 make free calls. Shinners Dec., Exh. 27 (Gil Dep.) at 24:19-24.

4 40. The Yuba phone room is generally available for use between 8 a.m. and 4
5 p.m., and sometimes earlier if a detainee needs to contact someone on the east coast. Shinners
6 Dec., Exh. 27 (Gil Dep.) at 25:19-23.

7 41. Detainees are limited to one 20-minute legal call per week in order "to
8 provide reasonable and equitable access for all detainees," and it takes about one week to process
9 a request. Ha Dec., Exh. 19; Berg Report at 15 ("As of August 2015, there was a 1 to 2-week
10 backlog in providing these calls at Yuba.").

11 42. Phones in this room retain the positive acceptance requirement. Berg
12 Report at 13.

13 43. Finally, the official policy is that the free legal telephone calls are limited to
14 phone calls made directly to a legal representative, preventing detainees from using the phone
15 room to call local agencies, potential witnesses or sponsors, or family members to gather evidence.
16 Ha Dec., Exh. 19; *see also* K.M. Dec. at ¶ 14; Docket No. 120-6 (O.A. Dec. at ¶ 23).

17 44. Yuba also permits free calls from a phone in the booking area. Shinners
18 Dec., Exh. 27 (Gil Dep.) at 21:22-23.

19 45. Yuba maintains a system for receiving incoming messages from attorneys.
20 *Id.* at 68:18-20. An attorney can call the facility, and facility staff are to deliver the message to the
21 detainee within hours. *Id.* at 68:22-17. An attorney can also e-mail or fax the facility a message to
22 be delivered to the detainee. *Id.* at 69:18-70:7.

23 5. Mesa Verde

24 46. Mesa Verde is a medium-security facility that houses only ICE detainees,
25 including those with high classifications. Shinners Dec., Exh. 8 (Murray Dep.) at 40:1-43:23;
26 Berg Report at 10.

27 47. Mesa Verde has four Units, and each of the Units has ten phones, many of
28 which are placed in large banks of telephone installations immediately adjacent to each other,

1 separated by Plexiglas partitions. Berg Report at 10; *see also* Takei Dec. at DSC00740, 754. The
2 holding cells are also equipped with a single telephone unit on wheels that can be rolled up to the
3 cell door. Berg Report at 10.

4 48. Housing Unit Phone calls can be monitored and recorded (although such
5 calls are not routinely monitored), except for calls to the Pro Bono Platform or to attorneys
6 registered with the facility and/or the phone provider, which are never recorded or monitored.
7 Shinners Dec., Exh. 10 (Bonnar Dec.) at ¶¶ 16-18.

8 49. Housing Unit Phones require no initiation fee, and per-minute rates are \$.10
9 for domestic calls and \$.15-35 for international calls. Ha Dec., Exh. 44. Phone calls are limited to
10 180 minutes. Docket No. 144-1 (Yee-Garcia Dec.), Exh. 60 (Talton Dep.) at 155:5-10.

11 50. Housing Unit Phones have a positive acceptance requirement, with the
12 phone playing an outgoing message stating: “This is an Intelmate automated operator with a
13 [PREPAID, FREE, COLLECT] from [RESIDENT’S NAME] at [FACILITY NAME].” Ha Dec.,
14 Exh. 7. The recipient is then given the option to accept or deny the call. *Id.*

15 51. Three-way calls are not permitted and will be blocked. *Id.*

16 52. Toll free numbers, *i.e.*, calls to 800, 866, 900 area codes, are blocked. Ha
17 Dec., Exh. 40 (Murray Dep.) at 95:3-19.

18 53. Detainees can access the Talton Free Call Platform from the Housing Unit
19 Phones. Berg Report at 10; *see also* Takei Dec., at DSC00711, 712, 739, 752. The free call
20 numbers do not include local government offices or local courts, and do not include all offices on
21 Defendants’ free legal services list. *Compare* Takei Dec. at DSC00616 with Ha Dec., Exh. 9.

22 54. Mesa Verde has several visitation rooms equipped with direct dial phones.
23 Mesa Verde’s stated policy is that free calls are permitted to the immigration court, federal and
24 state courts, consular offices, legal service providers, government offices, and other individuals if
25 there is a personal or family emergency or other compelling need. Shinners Dec., Exh. 17; Exh.
26 11 (Harvey Dep.) at 37:3-15; *see also* Shinners Dec., Exh. 10 (Bonnar Dec.) at ¶ 22 (“The facility
27 does not limit legal calls from the private room to calls to attorneys or legal representatives. The
28 facility will allow private legal calls to be made to courts; government agencies; witnesses; and

1 other verifiable, case-related contacts.”).

2 55. Mesa Verde informs detainees of this private phone option via the Mesa
3 Verde detainee handbook. *See* Plaintiffs Mot. at 18 (arguing that access to Phone Rooms at Yuba,
4 Contra Costa, and RCCC’s library option are “not made known to Plaintiffs through policy
5 documents or handbooks”); *see also* Docket No. 120-5 (R.K. Dec.) at ¶ 45 (“I read in a handbook
6 or posting somewhere in the facility that detainees can make free, private calls to attorneys.”).

7 56. Mesa Verde also allows callers to leave messages for detainees in two ways.
8 First, voicemails can be left for detainees; the cost of leaving a voicemail message is \$1.20 per
9 message. Shinners Dec., Exh. 11 (Bonnar Dec.) at ¶ 31. These voicemail messages are accessible
10 directly by the detainee, without having to be transcribed by a Mesa Verde employee. Ha Dec.,
11 Exh. 39 (Harvey Dep.) at 55:19-56:10. Second, legal representatives may also call the facility and
12 leave messages at no cost. *Id.* at ¶ 32. Emergency messages may be left using this latter system at
13 no cost. *Id.* Using this system, messages are written down and delivered no less than three times
14 a day. Ha Dec., Exh. 38 (Andrews Dep.) at 84:10-14. Because they are written down by a staff
15 member, they are not considered private. Ha Dec., Exh. 39 (Harvey Dep.) at 57:2-5.

16 B. Disputed Facts

17 The parties dispute a number of facts, primarily related to the availability of private phone
18 calls at each Facility.

- 19 • For the Contra Costa phone room, the parties dispute whether detainee calls are limited to
20 attorneys only, and the availability of these phone rooms. Defendants assert that detainee
21 calls have been made to non-attorneys from the phone rooms, and that the phone rooms are
22 available at any time upon request. *See* Shinners Dec., Exh. 20 (Bonthron Dep.) at 38:18-
23 20 (stating that detainees have 24/7 hour access to the private phone line in the phone
24 rooms); Shinners Dec., Exh. 24 (Lyon Dep.) at 66:16-24 (stating that detainees generally
25 cannot use phones during lockdown time, but that he was permitted to make a call because
26 his attorney had made a request for a call during that particular time beforehand); Shinners
27 Dec., Exh. 25 (V.V. Dep.) at 94:25-95:4; Shinners Dec., Exh. 37 (phone logs indicating
28 calls with family members). Plaintiffs contend that access is granted at the discretion of

- 1 individual deputies, and that many detainees are denied access outside of free-time hours.
2 Ha Dec., Exh. 36 (Neria-Garcia Dep.) at 61:22-62:1 (“In Contra Costa we -- we were only
3 allowed to use the phone during our free time, which was an hour per day.”); Phillips Dec.,
4 Exh. P (Lyon Dep.) at 48:23-49:2 (stating that phone room access was usually limited to
5 “free time, but it depends on the deputy, he can let you use it.”). Plaintiffs also present
6 evidence that until at least October 2015, the phone rooms were limited to attorney calls
7 only. Berg Report at 12 (“Detainee interviews confirmed that the phone rooms can only be
8 used to call attorneys and only during free-time hours, with some exceptions based on the
9 discretion of deputies”). For example, Lieutenant Bonthron explained in his August 2015
10 deposition that Contra Costa expanded its policy to allow phone use not just with
11 attorneys; however, Plaintiffs’ expert, Mr. Berg, reported that during his visit to Contra
12 Costa in October 2015, the deputies who demonstrated the phone system informed him
13 that they would disconnect the call if they determined that the call was not to an attorney’s
14 office. Shinners Dec., Exh. 20 (Bonthron Dep.) at 123:21-24; Berg Report at 12.
- 15 • At RCCC, the parties dispute whether the option to make phone calls from the law library
16 is truly private, as the phone is located on the library officer’s desk, close to where the
17 deputy sits, and is within earshot of other detainees using the library. Berg Report at 13;
18 *see also* Takei Dec., at DSC00422, 423, 428. There is also evidence that detainees are not
19 given advance notice of when they may use the library phone, and therefore cannot
20 schedule calls with their attorneys or other individuals. *See* Docket No. 120-8 (M.G. Dec.)
21 at ¶ 24; Docket No. 120-12 (I.P. Dec.) at ¶ 24.
 - 22 • For the Yuba phone room, the parties dispute whether this phone room is truly private, as
23 there is no barrier between the phones. Berg Report at 13; *see also* Takei Dec., at
24 DSC00190. Furthermore, under normal circumstances, it is expected that both telephones
25 will be used simultaneously, although Yuba’s policy states that “[w]hen a detainee
26 specifically requests a private phone call, they may be placed into the room alone.” Ha
27 Dec., Exh. 19.
 - 28 • For the Mesa Verde phone rooms, the parties dispute whether calls to non-attorneys are

1 permitted. Plaintiffs point to policies which explain the policy for obtaining legal calls as
2 submitting a detainee request (kite) to the shift supervisor with the phone number of the
3 attorney, which will then be verified by onsite staff. Ha Dec., Exh. 16. Plaintiffs also cite
4 to deposition testimony, in which Mesa Verde officials expressed uncertainty as to whether
5 a legal call would include witnesses. *See* Ha Dec., Exh. 40 (Murray Dep.) at 91:5-14
6 (stating that he did not know if a legal call included calls to witnesses); Yee-Garcia Dec.,
7 Exh. 54 (Harvey Dep.) at 74:15-75:20 (stating that she had not scheduled a call to a
8 potential witness for a pro se detainee, but also noting that she had “never had anybody ask
9 that, so I don’t really have an understanding of calling a witness.”).

10 C. Named Plaintiffs’ Experiences

11 Although the parties’ characterizations of these facts may differ, the parties do not dispute
12 the following facts regarding each of named Plaintiffs’ experiences.

13 1. Jose Astorga-Cervantes

14 57. Named Plaintiff Jose Astorga-Cervantes was detained at RCCC for ninety
15 days beginning on or about November 20, 2013. *See* Docket No. 14-3 (Astorga-Cervantes Dec.)
16 at ¶ 4; Shinners Dec., Exh. 7 (Astorga-Cervantes Dep.) at 33:16-17.

17 58. Beyond his thirty-second free phone call, he was unable to speak with his
18 family due to the costs of phone calls, except for once on December 17 when a fellow inmate
19 allowed him to use his phone credit. Astorga-Cervantes Dec. at ¶ 7.

20 59. With the assistance of his fellow detainees, Mr. Astorga-Cervantes was able
21 to use the Pro Bono Platform on the housing unit phones to contact several legal aid groups,
22 including Catholic Charities and another in Palo Alto. Shinners Dec., Exh. 7 (Astorga-Cervantes
23 Dep.) at 17:20-23. Both Catholic Charities and the group in Palo Alto informed him that they
24 could not pick up any more cases. *Id.* at 19:8-15.

25 60. Mr. Astorga-Cervantes was able to obtain an attorney for his first
26 immigration hearing on December 18, 2013. *Id.* at 40:3-16.

27 61. On January 23, 2014, the immigration judge granted Mr. Astorga-Cervantes
28 release on bond, which he paid on February 20, 2014. *Id.* at 60:17-61:10.

1 2. Nancy Neria-Garcia

2 62. Named Plaintiff Nancy Neria-Garcia was detained at Yuba from June 26,
3 2014 to March 26, 2015, at Mesa Verde from March 26, 2015 to June 3, 2015, and at Contra Costa
4 from June 4, 2015 until her release on October 22, 2015. Docket No. 120-7 (Neria-Garcia Dec.) at
5 ¶¶ 7-10; Shinners Dec., Exh. 36 (Neria-Garcia Dep.) at 18:11-15.

6 63. Ms. Garcia retained immigration counsel, who she was able to meet with in-
7 person and speak to on the phone while being held at Yuba. *See* Shinners Dec., Exh. 36 (Neria-
8 Garcia Dep.) at 27:3-9, 28:8-12.

9 64. Ms. Neria-Garcia’s access to phones varied depending on which housing
10 unit she was at. Neria-Garcia Dec. at ¶¶ 14-17. For example, in one housing unit, Ms. Neria-
11 Garcia was locked down in a cell for 23 hours a day, and could only access the telephone during
12 one hour of “hallway time.” *Id.* at ¶ 17.

13 65. Ms. Neria-Garcia was uncomfortable talking to her attorney about her case
14 on the housing unit phones due to lack of privacy.

15 66. It was not until October 2014 that she was informed by another detainee
16 that she could make free telephone calls from the phone room, although she had to share the phone
17 room with another detainee. *Id.* at ¶ 20.

18 67. Ms. Neria-Garcia had problems calling coworkers for assistance in her case
19 due to the positive acceptance requirement on the Housing Unit Phones; coworkers would not pick
20 up her calls because they did not know who was calling them from jail. Shinners Dec., Exh. 36
21 (Neria-Garcia Dep.) at 54:3-24.

22 68. While at Mesa Verde, Ms. Neria-Garcia read in the detainee handbook that
23 detainees could make private calls to their attorneys. Neria-Garcia Dec. at ¶ 25.

24 69. She would write requests to speak to her attorney, to varying degrees of
25 success; for example, one request was granted the next day, one was granted four days later, and
26 one was denied because she had to wait a few days before making another request. *Id.* at ¶ 26.

27 70. Ms. Neria-Garcia was able to make between eight and ten short calls to her
28 attorney from the Housing Unit Phones. Shinners Dec., Exh. 36 (Neria-Garcia Dep.) at 141:13-

1 18.

2 71. Ms. Neria-Garcia was held at Mesa Verde while her case was on appeal,
3 and has admitted that the telephone situation at Mesa Verde did not interfere with her case or her
4 ability to seek release on bond. *Id.* at 125:24-126:9.

5 72. While at Contra Costa, Ms. Neria-Garcia was able to meet her attorney in-
6 person between seven and ten times, and to speak with him using the phone room at least fifteen
7 times (but never the Housing Unit Phone). *Id.* at 143:23-145:16.

8 3. Audley Barrington Lyon, Jr.

9 73. Named Plaintiff Audley Barrington Lyon, Jr. was detained at Contra Costa
10 from October 22, 2013 to April 23, 2015. Docket No. 120-9 (Lyon Dec.) at ¶ 5; Compl. at ¶ 11;
11 Answer at ¶ 11.

12 74. Mr. Lyon was able to make phone calls using the Pro Bono Call platform by
13 December 3, 2013. Shinners Dec., Exh. 24 (Lyon Dep.) at 98:11-14.

14 75. Prior to obtaining representation, Mr. Lyon attempted to gather documents
15 on his own. Lyon Dec. at ¶ 5. During that time, he continued his case three times, for two to three
16 weeks each time, while he tried to gather documentation in support of his U visa application. *Id.*
17 at ¶¶ 5-7.

18 76. Relying on himself and his wife's assistance, he tried to obtain a police
19 report from the East Palo Alto Police Department and records from the victims services unit of the
20 San Mateo District Attorney's Office. *Id.* at ¶ 7. However, he was unable to call either the police
21 department or the victims services unit, as neither was willing to accept his call. *Id.* at ¶ 8.

22 77. Mr. Lyon's wife was also unable to obtain the police report because the
23 police department would only release it to Mr. Lyon or Mr. Lyon's legal representative. *Id.* at ¶
24 11.

25 78. Mr. Lyon had difficulty communicating with his wife because she could not
26 afford to pay for telephone calls; instead, they would communicate by writing letters, a process he
27 considered slow and inefficient as a simple question caused a delay of several days. *Id.* at ¶ 9-10.

28 79. Mr. Lyon was eventually able to retain counsel in early 2014. *Id.* at 28:1-

1 23. After he obtained counsel, Mr. Lyon was able to communicate with his attorney because she
2 would come to the building so that he did not need to call her. Shinners Dec., Exh. 24 (Lyon
3 Dep.) at 94:2-8.

4 **III. DISCUSSION**

5 A. Standard of Review

6 The Court shall grant a motion for summary judgment “if the movant shows that there is
7 no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of
8 law.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 56(a). An issue of fact is genuine only if there is sufficient evidence for a
9 reasonable jury to find for the nonmoving party. *See Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S.
10 242, 248-49 (1986). “The mere existence of a scintilla of evidence in support of the [non-moving
11 party]’s position will be insufficient; there must be evidence on which the jury could reasonably
12 find for the [non-moving party].” *Id.* at 252. At the same time, “all reasonable inferences must be
13 drawn in favor of the non-movant.” *John v. City of El Monte*, 515 F.3d 936, 941 (9th Cir. 2008).

14 The moving party bears the burden of demonstrating the absence of a genuine issue of
15 material fact. *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986). Where the non-moving party
16 has the ultimate burden of proof, the moving party may prevail on a motion for summary
17 judgment by pointing to the non-moving party’s failure “to make a showing sufficient to establish
18 the existence of an element essential to that party’s case.” *Id.* at 322.

19 B. Immigration and Nationality Act (INA)

20 First, Plaintiffs allege that their rights to counsel and to present evidence, as articulated by
21 the INA, are violated by the Facilities’ phone conditions. Plaintiffs Mot. at 25. The INA itself
22 does not dictate the precise level of telephone access required for detainees. Instead, Plaintiffs
23 rely on 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(b)(4) to establish their rights under the INA. Section 1229a governs
24 removal proceedings generally, while section 1229a(b)(4) delineates an alien’s rights in
25 proceedings, which include:

26
27 (A) the alien shall have the privilege of being represented, at no
28 expense to the Government, by counsel of the alien’s choosing who
is authorized to practice in such proceedings,

1 (B) the alien shall have a reasonable opportunity to examine the
2 evidence against the alien, to present evidence on the alien’s own
3 behalf, and to cross-examine witnesses presented by the
4 Government but these rights shall not entitle the alien to examine
5 such national security information as the Government may proffer in
6 opposition to the alien’s admission to the United states or to an
7 application by the alien for discretionary relief under this chapter,
8 and⁸

9 (C) a complete record shall be kept of all testimony and evidence
10 produced at the proceeding.

11 Plaintiffs argue that a necessary condition of these statutory rights include the ability to retain or
12 consult with counsel under section 1229a(b)(4)(A), and to obtain evidence under section
13 1229a(b)(4)(B).

14 1. Right to Counsel

15 Because removal proceedings are civil rather than criminal proceedings, “litigants in
16 removal proceedings have no Sixth Amendment right to counsel.” *Torres-Chavez v. Holder*, 567
17 F.3d 1096, 1100 (9th Cir. 2009) (citation omitted). However, the Ninth Circuit has also
18 recognized that “[t]he right to counsel in immigration proceedings is rooted in the Due Process
19 Clause and codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1362 and 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(b)(4)(A).” *Biwot v. Gonzales*, 403
20 F.3d 1094, 1098 (9th Cir. 2005).

21 Plaintiffs contend that a detainee’s statutory rights under the INA should be informed by
22 Sixth Amendment cases concerning the rights of criminal defendants to counsel. Plaintiffs Mot. at
23 22, 25. In support, Plaintiffs cite *Montes-Lopez v. Holder*, in which the Ninth Circuit found that a
24 petitioner’s right to be represented in removal proceedings was violated when the immigration
25 judge (IJ) refused to continue the hearing when the petitioner’s attorney failed to appear. 694 F.3d
26 1085, 1086 (9th Cir. 2012). In concluding that an alien need not show prejudice where an alien is
27 denied a statutory right to be represented by counsel, the Ninth Circuit drew in part on the “logic
28 that has guided [its] interpretation of the Sixth Amendment.” *Id.* at 1092-93. However, the Ninth

⁸ 8 U.S.C. § 1362 likewise states that: “In any removal proceedings before an immigration judge and in any appeal proceedings before the Attorney General from any such removal proceedings, the person concerned shall have the privilege of being represented (at no expense to the Government) by such counsel, authorized to practice in such proceedings, as he shall choose.”

1 Circuit did not so go far as to suggest that courts should import rights due under the Sixth
2 Amendment to the immigration context; instead, the Ninth Circuit acknowledged that “[t]he Sixth
3 Amendment does not apply in the immigration context.” *Id.* at 1092.

4 Other Ninth Circuit decisions have declined to apply rights and standards owed under the
5 Sixth Amendment in the immigration context. For example, the Ninth Circuit has held that
6 “*Miranda* warnings are not required before questioning in the context of a civil deportation
7 hearing . . . because deportation proceedings are not criminal prosecutions, but are civil in nature.”
8 *United States v. Solano-Godines*, 120 F.3d 957, 960 (9th Cir. 1997); *see also id.* at 960-61 (“The
9 full panoply of procedural and substantive safeguards which are provided in a criminal proceeding
10 are not required at a deportation hearing”) (internal modifications and citation omitted). The
11 Ninth Circuit has also noted that with respect to ineffective assistance of counsel, the Sixth
12 Amendment framework does not apply; instead, “aliens shoulder a heavier burden of proof in
13 establishing ineffective assistance of counsel under the Fifth Amendment than under the Sixth
14 Amendment.”⁹ *Torres-Chavez v. Holder*, 567 F.3d 1096, 1100 (9th Cir. 2009) (citation omitted).

15 Given that the Ninth Circuit has generally recognized that the Sixth Amendment does not
16 apply to removal hearings because they are civil proceedings, the Court declines to adopt
17 Plaintiffs’ suggestion that Sixth Amendment cases should be applied to determine what rights are
18 required to satisfy the INA’s right to counsel. *See* Docket No. 141 (Plaintiffs Opp.) at 23. The
19 Ninth Circuit has never so held, and the Court is reluctant to so interpret the INA absent any
20 indication that Congress intended to import full Sixth Amendment standards into the INA.
21 Plaintiffs have not submitted any such indication.

22 The Court must therefore look to existing precedent. The Ninth Circuit has thus far only
23 found violations of the statutory right to counsel where conditions were “tantamount to denial of
24

25 ⁹ While *Torres-Chavez* analyzed the plaintiff’s ineffective assistance of counsel claim by applying
26 the Sixth Amendment framework, that was because the Sixth Amendment applied a higher
27 standard; thus, “[i]f an attorney’s performance passes muster under *Strickland*, it cannot render an
28 alien’s proceeding fundamentally unfair. In other words, there is no violation of the alien’s Fifth
Amendment right to due process if the alien’s counsel was effective for Sixth Amendment
purposes.” 567 F.3d at 1100. *Torres-Chavez* does not suggest that courts should apply rights due
under the Sixth Amendment, as Plaintiffs contend. *See* Plaintiffs Opp. at 23.

1 counsel.” *Biwot*, 403 F.3d at 1099 (finding that IJs should grant reasonable continuances to give
2 an alien sufficient time to locate counsel and permit counsel to prepare for a hearing); *see also*
3 *Rios-Berrios v. INS*, 776 F.2d 859, 862-63 (9th Cir. 1985) (finding that IJ should have continued
4 the hearing to provide the petitioner reasonable time to locate counsel where petitioner was
5 effectively given only two business days to obtain an attorney, was in custody, spoke only
6 Spanish, had limited education, was unfamiliar with the country and legal procedures, and was
7 3,000 miles from his only friend in the country).

8 Here, while Plaintiffs present evidence that telephone restrictions result in difficulty
9 locating, retaining, and consulting with counsel, Plaintiffs have not presented evidence that these
10 restrictions were “tantamount to denial of counsel.” For example, Plaintiffs acknowledge that
11 many of their witnesses did eventually find counsel after months of searching and with assistance
12 from friends or family. *See* Plaintiffs Opp. at 4, fn. 9. There are also available means of
13 communicating with counsel, whether by non-private calls, legal mail, in-person meetings, and
14 scheduling private calls. While these options may limit the effectiveness of communications with
15 counsel, Plaintiffs have not shown that they are tantamount to an outright *denial* of counsel. For
16 this reason on this record, the Court finds that Defendants are entitled to summary judgment on
17 this claim.

18 2. Right to a Full and Fair Hearing Under Section 1229a(b)(4)(B)

19 Next, Plaintiffs contend there is a right to a full and fair hearing -- which includes a
20 reasonable opportunity to prepare the case, including the gathering of evidence -- based on Section
21 1229a(b)(4)(B) on the INA. Plaintiffs Mot. at 23; Compl. at ¶ 107. Again, section 1229a(b)(4)(B)
22 require that “the alien shall have a reasonable opportunity to examine the evidence against the
23 alien, to present evidence on the alien’s own behalf, and to cross-examine witnesses presented by
24 the Government” However, none of the cases examining the INA cited by Plaintiffs discuss
25 a general right to gather evidence in preparation for a hearing; instead, they focus primarily on
26 whether an IJ’s denial of a continuance of a hearing resulted in the exclusion of evidence. *See*
27 *Cruz Rendon v. Holder*, 603 F.3d 1104, 1110 (9th Cir. 2010) (“When determining whether an IJ
28 has abused her discretion, we consider a number of factors, including: (1) the nature of the

1 evidence excluded as a result of the denial of the continuance); *Baires v. INS*, 856 F.2d 89, 92
2 (9th Cir. 1988) (petitioner’s statutory right to present evidence was violated where IJ denied
3 request for a continuance and change of venue, preventing petitioner from presenting the
4 testimony of his expert witness and two other potential witnesses).¹⁰

5 Plaintiffs’ reliance on *Dent v. Holder* is misplaced. In *Dent v. Holder*, the Ninth Circuit
6 found that the ICE was statutorily required to provide documents in the petitioner’s A-file which
7 were relevant to the petitioner’s citizenship claim. 627 F.3d 365, 369, 374 (9th Cir. 2010). *Dent*
8 is distinguishable on two grounds. First, *Dent* was not decided on statutory grounds, but on due
9 process grounds, as the Ninth Circuit found that the failure to provide the A-file documents
10 violated the petitioner’s Fifth Amendment right to due process (including the right to a full and
11 fair hearing).¹¹ *Id.* at 374. Second, the Ninth Circuit’s finding that the petitioner was entitled to
12 his A-file was premised on section 1229a(c)(2)(B), which expressly gives an alien access to his
13 entry document and any other non-confidential records pertaining to the alien’s admission or
14 presence in the country. *Id.* Thus, there was a direct violation of the plaintiff’s right to particular
15 evidence as specifically required by statute.

17 ¹⁰ In *Cruz Rendon* and *Baires*, the evidence was available for the hearing, but could not actually be
18 presented at the hearing because of the IJ’s action. See *Cruz Rendon*, 603 F.3d at 1109 (IJ
19 precluded Cruz Rendon from testifying as to any topic that was mentioned in her son’s
20 psychological evaluation, including “the life she had created for [her son] in the United States,
21 [her son’s] medical and educational needs, and the hardships [her son] would face if forced to
22 relocate to Mexico”); *Baires*, 856 F.2d at 92 (denial of continuance precluded presentation of
23 evidence because “[t]he necessary arrangements for the testimony of these potential witnesses
24 could not be completed by April 15, nor was the expert able to travel to Florence”). The
25 challenged conduct in these cases was more proximate to the presentation of evidence at the
26 hearing than the alleged interference with the investigation and gathering of evidence at issue in
27 the instant case.

28 ¹¹ Plaintiffs’ other cases do not rely on the statutory right to present evidence under section
1229a(b)(4)(B), but instead rely on due process grounds, see *Ibarra-Flores v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d
614, 621 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that petitioner’s due process rights were violated where IJ
refused to order the INS to produce petitioner’s voluntary departure form), or the failure to provide
a petitioner with a reasonable opportunity to examine the evidence against him in the hearing. See
Singh v. Holder, 405 Fed. Appx. 193, 194 (9th Cir. 2010) (holding that petitioner’s statutory right
to examine the evidence against him was violated where the IJ refused to grant a continuance to
allow the petitioner to conduct a forensic analysis of the original letters that the government had
failed to provide even though the government knew the petitioner wanted to use the letters in his
defense against the government’s allegations).

1 In contrast, Plaintiffs’ concern in the instant case is the process of gathering evidence in
2 advance of a hearing, evidence such as that from family members, the community, and other
3 government agencies (such as local police departments); the INA does not expressly address the
4 process of gathering such evidence. Neither the language of the statute (which provides only for
5 the reasonable opportunity to *present* evidence) nor any existing case precedent cited by Plaintiffs
6 supports Plaintiffs’ expansive reading of the INA that would provide for a general right to
7 investigate and gather evidence in advance of and in preparation for a removal hearing.¹² Thus,
8 the Court holds that Defendants are also entitled to summary judgment on this statutory claim.

9 C. Due Process

10 Plaintiffs assert that their rights to counsel and to a full and fair hearing under the due
11 process clause have been violated. In general, “[t]he Fifth Amendment guarantees due process in
12 deportation proceedings. As a result, an alien who faces deportation is entitled to a full and fair
13 hearing of his claims and a reasonable opportunity to present evidence on his behalf.” *Colmenar*
14 *v. INS*, 210 F.3d 967, 971 (9th Cir. 2000) (citations omitted). A decision can be reversed on due
15 process grounds “if the proceeding ‘was so fundamentally unfair that the alien was prevented from
16 reasonably presenting his case.’” *Id.* (quoting *Platero-Cortez v. INS*, 804 F.2d 1127, 1132 (9th
17 Cir. 1986). The alien must also “show prejudice, which means that the outcome of the proceeding
18 may have been affected by the alleged violation.” *Id.*

19 1. Substantive Due Process

20 Plaintiffs contend that their confinement violates substantive due process in two ways: (1)
21 being housed in conditions identical to county prisoners awaiting criminal trials and serving
22 criminal sentences is unconstitutionally punitive, and (2) restrictions and denial of telephone
23 access prolong Plaintiffs’ detention without any compelling justification. Plaintiffs Mot. at 44-45.

24 a. Conditions of Confinement

25 First, the Court finds that Defendants are correct in that Plaintiffs did not expressly plead a

26 _____
27 ¹² To the extent Plaintiffs again rely on *Montes-Lopez* and *Torres-Chavez*, the Court finds for the
28 reasons stated above that neither of these cases stands for the proposition that rights under Sixth
Amendment jurisprudence should be applied in the immigration context.

1 claim regarding the conditions of confinement. Plaintiffs’ complaint is focused specifically on the
2 alleged failure to provide adequate phone access; it does not challenge the practice of confining
3 detainees in conditions identical to criminal prisoners. *See* FAC at ¶ 91 (class wide allegation that
4 Defendants have engaged in a common course of conduct of denying and restricting Plaintiffs’
5 telephone access). While Plaintiffs do allege due process violations, which could encompass both
6 procedural and substantive due process violations, Plaintiffs’ due process violations are still
7 related to the failure to provide adequate phone access, and the resulting impacts. FAC at ¶¶ 100-
8 109. Because Plaintiffs did not plead any claims or facts challenging their confinement in
9 conditions identical to criminal prisoners, no such claim is at issue, and the Court finds that
10 summary judgment in favor of Defendants on this claim is appropriate.

11 b. Prolonged Imprisonment

12 Second, the Court finds that Plaintiffs do not have a claim for substantive due process as to
13 prolonged imprisonment. Unlike their challenge to the conditions of confinement, Plaintiffs did
14 make specific allegations of prolonged incarceration. FAC at ¶¶ 69-70. Specifically, Plaintiffs
15 allege that “Defendants’ restriction and denial of telephone access to immigrants held in ICE
16 custody substantially prolongs Plaintiffs’ incarceration pending removal hearings [because a]
17 master calendar hearings, Plaintiffs are forced to ask the immigration judge for a continuance to
18 retain counsel, to prepare their cases, or simply to obtain legal advice” *Id.* at ¶ 69.

19 In *Zadvydas v. Davis*, the Supreme Court found that a statute which permitted aliens to be
20 detained following a final order of removal did not permit indefinite detention. 533 U.S. 678, 682,
21 690 (2001). In so ruling, it recognized a six-month (180 days) period in which an alien can be
22 held, after which “once the alien provides good reason to believe that there is no significant
23 likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future, the Government must respond with
24 evidence sufficient to rebut that showing.” *Id.* at 701.

25 Subsequent decisions have recognized this six-month incarceration period. For example,
26 in *Demore v. Kim*, the Supreme Court rejected a respondent’s habeas corpus action, in which the
27 respondent argued that his detention under section 1226(c) violated due process because no
28 determination had been made that he posed either a danger to society or a flight risk. 538 U.S.

1 510, 514 (2003). The Supreme Court distinguished *Zadvydas* in two respects. First, it explained
2 that *Zadvydas* dealt with aliens who challenged their detention following final orders of
3 deportation but “for whom removal was ‘no longer practically attainable.’” *Id.* at 527 (quoting
4 *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690). In such cases, the purpose of detention (to hold people in preparation
5 for removal) “no longer bears a reasonable relation to the purpose for which the individual was
6 committed” because for those individuals, removal was not possible. *Id.* (quoting *Zadvydas*, 533
7 U.S. at 690). By contrast, *Demore* involved detention of deportable criminal aliens pending their
8 removal proceedings, and “[s]uch detention necessarily serves the purpose of preventing
9 deportable criminal aliens from fleeing prior to or during their removal proceedings, thus
10 increasing the chance that, if ordered removed, the alien will be successfully removed.” *Id.* at
11 527-28. Second, the Supreme Court concluded that *Zadvydas* was “materially different” because
12 it involved an indefinite and potentially permanent duration, whereas *Demore* involved detention
13 “of a much shorter duration.” *Id.* at 528. It noted that in most cases, detention lasted “less than
14 the 90 days we considered presumptively valid in *Zadvydas*,” as in 85% of the cases in which
15 aliens were detained pursuant to section 1226(c), removal proceedings were completed in an
16 average time of 47 days and a median of 30 days. *Id.* at 529. Even in the remaining 15% of cases,
17 in which the alien appealed, the appeal took an average of four months. *Id.* “In sum, the detention
18 at stake under § 1226(c) lasts roughly a month and a half in the vast majority of cases in which it
19 is invoked, and about five months in the minority of cases in which the alien chooses to appeal.”
20 *Id.* at 530. While the respondent had been detained for six months, the Supreme Court noted that
21 “respondent himself had requested a continuance of his removal hearing.” *Id.* at 531. Based on
22 these distinctions, the Supreme Court rejected the respondent’s habeas claim.

23 The Ninth Circuit has also recognized that prolonged incarceration typically requires
24 incarceration of at least 180 days. *See Diouf v. Napolitano*, 634 F.3d 1081, 1091 (9th Cir. 2011);
25 *see also Rodriguez v. Robbins*, 715 F.3d 1127, 1138 (9th Cir. 2013) (“As a general matter,
26 detention is prolonged when it has lasted six months and is expected to continue more than
27 minimally beyond six months”) (quotation omitted). In *Diouf*, at issue were DHS regulations that
28 provided for custody reviews within 90 days, 180 days, and 18 months of confinement. *Id.* at

1 1089. During the 90-day removal period, DHS was required to detain the alien, after which
2 continued detention was at the discretion of the Attorney General. *Id.* The Ninth Circuit found
3 that there were no serious constitutional concerns with the initial 90-day review period because its
4 focus was “on *prolonged* detention.” *Id.* at 1091. As to the time between the 90-day and 180-day
5 review period, the Ninth Circuit found that “[d]etention during this period certainly affects aliens’
6 interests in freedom from confinement, and requires that adequate procedural safeguards be in
7 place to protect against the erroneous deprivation of liberty. But given the relatively limited
8 period of detention involved, and in view of the *Mathews* factors as a whole, the period afforded
9 by the DHS regulations is adequate.” *Id.* However, after the 180-day period, the Ninth Circuit
10 found that the alien’s detention could be prolonged an additional year; thus, “[a]t this point, the
11 alien’s continuing detention becomes prolonged.” *Id.*

12 In the instant case, Plaintiffs cite no cases in which a court found a violation of substantive
13 due process for prolonged incarceration that lasted less than the presumptively valid six-month
14 period in the immigration context.¹³ Here, Plaintiffs themselves present evidence that the average
15 time of detention between June 1, 2014 and May 30, 2015 was about 36 days, and the majority of
16 stays (59%) were less than three weeks. Docket No. 119-6, Exh. A (Levy Report) at ¶ 6. While
17 there are a few individuals who have been detained for more than 180 days, including Mr. Lyon
18 (detained October 2013 and April 2015) and Ms. Neria-Garcia (detained between June 2014 and
19 October 2015), Plaintiffs’ expert notes that in general, “[m]any detainees are held for very short
20 periods of time, while a few are held for very long periods of time.”¹⁴ *Id.*

21
22 _____
23 ¹³ Plaintiffs do cite *Zavala v. Ridge*, 310 F. Supp. 2d 1071 (N.D. Cal. 2004); however, this case
24 was a challenge to a regulation which automatically stayed the IJ’s decision to grant bond. *Id.* at
25 1075. As the district court explained, this automatic stay, “which permits unilateral government
26 detention of individuals without a case-by-case determination after a reasoned finding that they do
not pose threat to safety or a risk of flight, violates the Due Process Clause because no special
justification exists that outweighs the individual’s constitutionally protected interest in avoiding
physical restraint.” *Id.* at 1077. In short, *Zavala* challenged the *detention* itself, not the length of
the detention, which is the issue in this case.

27 ¹⁴ Notably, even the Mesa Verde numbers, which Dr. Levy notes “are distorted because of the
28 transfer of long-term detainees from other facilities,” note an average stay of 157.4 days, below
the 180-day period that the Ninth Circuit found significant.

1 Here, it cannot be said that the class is subject to a systemic prolongation of detention
2 which applies “generally to the class” which would make injunctive relief “appropriate respecting
3 the class as a whole,” as contemplated by Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2). With the exception of the two
4 named Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs’ evidence shows that the vast majority of detainees are held for less
5 than three weeks. Based on the evidence in the record, Plaintiffs have failed to show that as a
6 class they have established a substantive due process claim based on systemic prolonged
7 detention. Thus, Defendants are entitled to summary judgment on this claim.¹⁵

8 2. Procedural Due Process

9 a. Actual Injury Requirement

10 The parties dispute whether Plaintiffs must show an actual injury in order to assert a
11 procedural due process claim, as was required in *Lewis v. Casey*. In *Lewis*, the Supreme Court
12 found that the actual right at issue was not the right to a law library and legal assistance programs;
13 instead, access to a law library and legal assistance programs were a “means for ensuring a
14 reasonably adequate opportunity to present claimed violations of fundamental constitutional rights
15 to the courts.” 518 U.S. at 351 (quotation omitted). Thus, to bring a claim, the Supreme Court
16 found that the inmates had to show that they had actually been hindered in pursuing their legal
17 claims, *i.e.*, by demonstrating that an inmate was unable to file a complaint or had a complaint
18 dismissed for failure to observe a technicality. *Id.* As applied in the instant case, Defendants
19 argue that Plaintiffs must show that telephone restrictions “have actually hindered Plaintiffs from
20 pursuing their cases or requests for release on bond.” Defendants Mot. at 28.

21 Plaintiffs in turn argue that *Lewis* is distinguishable because that case concerned sentenced
22 prisoners, whereas here Plaintiffs are civil detainees facing immigration proceedings. Plaintiffs
23

24 ¹⁵ While the Court finds that there is no substantive due process claim, this does not preclude a
25 *procedural* due process claim. See *Prieto-Romero v. Clark*, 534 F.3d 1053, 1065 (9th Cir. 2008)
26 (“Even if Prieto-Romero’s continued detention is permitted by statute, however, due process
27 requires ‘adequate procedural protections’ to ensure that the government’s asserted justification
28 for physical confinement ‘outweighs the individual’s constitutionally protected interest in
avoiding physical restraint.’”). This is particularly so in light of the discussion which follows
which concludes the injury requirement to make a procedural due process claims has a degree of
flexibility.

1 Opp. at 26. The Court agrees. In *Benjamin v. Fraser*, the Second Circuit declined to apply the
2 *Lewis* actual injury requirement to a case challenging conditions affecting attorney visitation, use
3 of restraints, restrictive housing, inmate correspondence, and law libraries. 264 F.3d 175, 179,
4 185 (2d Cir. 2001). First, the Second Circuit explained that *Lewis* did not concern a direct
5 constitutional right, but an opportunity to present claimed violations of constitutional rights. The
6 *Benjamin* case, however, concerned conditions which interfered with an individual’s ability to
7 consult with counsel, which itself was a constitutional right. *Id.* Second, the Second Circuit
8 reasoned that the interest of a convicted prisoner is distinct from the interest of a pretrial detainee;
9 in short:

10
11 The access claims at issue in *Lewis* concerned the ability of
12 convicted prisoners to attack their sentences, directly or collaterally,
13 and to challenge the conditions of their confinement. By contrast,
14 here we are concerned with the Sixth Amendment right of a pretrial
15 detainee, in a case brought against him by the state to utilize counsel
16 in his defense. It is not clear to us what “actual injury” would even
17 mean as applied to a pretrial detainee’s right to counsel.

18 *Id.* at 186 (internal quotations and modifications omitted). In other words, “pretrial detainees need
19 access to the courts and counsel is not to present claims to the courts, but to defend against the
20 charges brought against them.” *Id.*

21 Here, Plaintiffs are not seeking phone access in order affirmatively to present
22 constitutional claims, like the prisoners in *Lewis*. Rather, Plaintiffs contend that phone conditions
23 have impaired their right to gather and present evidence in *defending themselves* against the
24 government’s effort to deport them. In this context, detainees have a Fifth Amendment guarantee
25 to a full and fair hearing, and this includes access to counsel (of their own choosing). *See Oshodi*
26 *v. Holder*, 729 F.3d 883, 889 (9th Cir. 2013) (“It is well established that the Fifth Amendment
27 guarantees non-citizens due process in removal proceedings. Therefore, every individual in
28 removal proceedings is entitled to a full and fair hearing. A vital hallmark of a full and fair
hearing is the opportunity to present evidence and testimony on one’s behalf.”) (internal
quotations omitted); *Rios-Berrios*, 776 F.2d at 862 (Although a deportation hearing is not a
criminal matter and [an alien] had no Sixth Amendment right to appointment of counsel at

1 government expense, due process mandates that [an alien] is entitled to counsel of his own choice
2 at his own expense under the terms of the [INA].”) (citation omitted).

3 Furthermore, like *Benjamin*, Plaintiffs are not convicted inmates but civil detainees who
4 are defending themselves in proceedings brought by the government. Thus, the Court finds *Lewis*
5 does not apply, and thus Plaintiffs are not required to show actual injury or actual hindrance of
6 detainees’ ability to pursue their cases in order to assert a procedural due process claim.

7 Instead, under circumstances outside of *Lewis*, the Ninth Circuit has held that the court
8 looks not to whether the outcome of a hearing was actually affected by an alleged violation, but at
9 whether “the outcome of the proceeding *may* have been affected by the alleged violation.”
10 *Colmenar*, 210 F.3d at 971 (emphasis added); *see also Zolotukhin v. Gonzales*, 417 F.3d 1073,
11 1076 (9th Cir. 2005) (“For us to grant the petition for review on due process grounds, Petitioner
12 must show prejudice, which means that the outcome of the proceedings *may have been affected* by
13 the alleged violation.”) (internal quotation omitted) (emphasis in original).

14 In *Walters*, the Ninth Circuit upheld the district court’s finding that the INS’s procedure for
15 obtaining waivers in document fraud cases violated the plaintiffs’ rights to due process of law.
16 *Walters v. Reno*, 145 F.3d 1032, 1036 (9th Cir. 1998). There, the plaintiffs brought a class action,
17 alleging that the INS issued complex, confusing forms to aliens charged with violating the INA’s
18 document fraud provisions, which failed to adequately inform aliens of the steps they had to take
19 in order to contest the charges brought against them. *Id.* In challenging the district court’s
20 finding, the government argued that there was insufficient evidence that the plaintiff class suffered
21 prejudice as a result of the constitutionally deficient proceedings. *Id.* at 1044. The Ninth Circuit
22 found that the issue of prejudice “overlap[ped] with the question whether the plaintiffs suffered
23 actual injury to justify injunctive relief,” before explaining that plaintiffs had made the required
24 showing of prejudice. *Id.* at 1044 n. 7. It first reiterated that “[w]hen it is necessary to
25 demonstrate prejudice as a result of a constitutional violation, the alien must show that the
26 inadequate procedures occurred in a manner so as *potentially* to affect the outcome of the
27 proceedings.” *Id.* at 1044 (emphasis added) (citations omitted). Thus, “there must be *plausible*
28 *scenarios* in which the outcome of the proceedings would have been different, absent the

1 constitutional violation.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

2 Thus, Plaintiffs are not required to show actual injury, as defined by *Lewis*. Instead,
3 Plaintiffs need only establish that the outcome of immigration proceedings *may* have been affected
4 by the alleged violation. So defined, the Court finds that there is sufficient evidence of prejudice
5 to the class as a result of telephone restrictions. For example, Mr. Lyon stated in his December
6 2013 declaration that he was unable to obtain a police report he needed for his U-visa application,
7 as he was unable to call the East Palo Alto Police Department because the police did not take
8 collect calls. Lyon Dec. at ¶ 8. Mr. Lyon’s wife, who was assisting him, also could not obtain the
9 police report because the police would only release the report to Mr. Lyon or his legal
10 representative, which he did not have at the time. *Id.* at ¶¶ 9, 11. It was not until he retained
11 counsel (which at the time of his declaration, he could not afford) that he could obtain the police
12 report.

13 Similarly, B.M. testified that he was able to retain an attorney, but that he was not able to
14 get through to his attorney from the Housing Unit Phones because his attorney did not accept
15 collect calls. Docket No. 120-16 (B.M. Dec.) at ¶¶ 13, 14. Between June 16, 2014 and August 20,
16 2014, B.M. was only able to see his attorney once, when his attorney was at Contra Costa to visit
17 another detainee. *Id.* at ¶ 15. At this time, B.M.’s attorney informed him that he had a hearing on
18 August 20, 2014, but they were otherwise unable to speak about what that hearing would entail.
19 *Id.* at ¶¶ 15-17. At the August 20, 2014 hearing, the IJ informed B.M. that he would need to get
20 documents from Kenya and Somalia; when B.M. explained it would be difficult to make those
21 calls from detention, the IJ said his attorney would help. *Id.* at ¶ 18. In September 2014, Contra
22 Costa opened the phone room, permitting free calls that were usually limited only to 5-10 minutes.
23 *Id.* at ¶ 21. B.M. was able to get in contact with his attorney more often, but communication was
24 still difficult because his attorney did not always answer his calls (which were unpredictable due
25 to the limited time and the number of other attorneys who needed to use the phone). *Id.* at ¶ 22.
26 In December 2014, B.M. learned from an ICE officer that the IJ denied asylum, after which
27 B.M.’s attorney informed him that he would not help appeal the decision. *Id.* at ¶ 23. B.M. then
28 began calling free legal service organizations to find another attorney, and learned from a Centro

1 Legal de la Raza attorney that a large part of the reason why his asylum case was denied was
2 because he did not prove his evidence with available evidence. *Id.* at ¶ 24. B.M. states that his
3 attorney did not help him get the evidence to prove his identity (which he could not obtain himself
4 due to phone restrictions), and that B.M. did not realize how ineffective his attorney was because
5 he communicated with his attorney so rarely. *Id.* at ¶ 25. The Centro Legal de la Raza attorney
6 has since helped get B.M. released on bond and filed a motion to reopen the case based on
7 ineffective assistance of counsel. *Id.* at ¶ 26.

8 Other declarants have discussed the impacts of limited phone access on their ability to
9 gather evidence, although it is less clear what impact that failure to gather evidence had on the
10 outcome of a hearing. *See* O.A. Dec. at ¶ 14 (inability to contact a gang prevention program for
11 documents, likely attributable to the gang prevention program’s refusal to accept a call that stated
12 it was from an unspecified “inmate” at Yuba County Jail); Docket No. 120-11 (J.H. Dec.) at ¶ 12
13 (inability to contact the criminal court and Kern county public defender in order to work on
14 vacating his criminal conviction because the county offices hang up when they hear the recording
15 that the call is from a detention facility); I.P. Dec. at ¶¶ 6, 42-43 (delaying bond hearing by a
16 month because of the delay in gather evidence due to high phone costs; bond was granted at the
17 continued hearing); Docket No. 120-13 (H.S. Dec.) at ¶ 15 (inability to speak freely about his case
18 on Housing Unit phones because his claim for relief is based on sexual orientation, and expressing
19 fear that he would be harassed and physically attacked if his sexual orientation is discovered);
20 Docket No. 120-14 (F.L. Dec.) at ¶ 36 (fear of speaking about his case on Housing Unit Phones
21 because applying for a U-Visa and concerned about being physically attacked if other detainees or
22 county inmates learn that he is cooperating with the police); *see also* Berg Report at 6 (concluding
23 that “the telephone policies and practices challenged in this case significantly limit the ability of
24 detainees to retain and communicate with counsel and gather evidence for their cases”), 17 (“The
25 detainees I interviewed expressed frustration, resignation, and hopelessness related to the
26 difficulty of pursuing their cases with the limited telephone access provided to them. This
27 situation, many times, motivates detainees to simply sign removal papers”); Supp. Vincent Dec. at
28 ¶ 13 (attorney declaration explaining hesitation to take on complex cases for detained immigrants

1 because “telephone access is too unreliable to provide adequate legal representation”); Docket No.
2 120-18 (Lee Dec.) at ¶ 12 (attorney declaration explaining that in her experience, “[i]n comparison
3 to my non detained clients, detained clients are prevented from playing an active role in their
4 removal proceedings because of the current telephone restrictions”); Docket No. 120-22 (Prasad
5 Dec.) at ¶ 12 (attorney declaration stating “[w]e regularly see detainees not represented by counsel
6 denied bond or discretionary relief who, in my experience, may not have been denied if they had
7 been able to contact family to obtain documents”).

8 This evidence, along with the nature and breadth of the systemic phone restrictions and
9 their potential impact upon detainees’ ability to communicate with counsel, relatives, government
10 agencies, etc., are sufficient to establish a real risk for class members that the restrictions “may” or
11 “potentially” affect the outcome of removal proceedings; there are “plausible scenarios” in which
12 outcomes are affected. *Colmenar*, 210 F.3d at 971; *Zolotukhin*, 417 F.3d at 1076; *Walters*, 145
13 F.3d at 1049.

14 Plaintiffs need not demonstrate every member of the class has suffered from an adverse
15 effect on the outcome of their renewal hearing. The Ninth Circuit has made clear that “[i]t is
16 sufficient if class members complain of a pattern or practice that is generally applicable to the
17 class as a whole. Even if some class members have not been injured by the challenged practice, a
18 class may nevertheless be appropriate.” *Walters*, 145 F.3d at 1047. This is particularly the case in
19 a Rule 23(b)(2) class action, where the defining feature is whether “the party opposing the class
20 has acted or refused to act on grounds that apply *generally* to the class . . . ,” and whether
21 injunctive relief is appropriate respecting the *class as a whole*.¹⁶ Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2)

22
23 ¹⁶ By way of example, if a prison hospital had a policy of not sterilizing its equipment, resulting in
24 significantly increased risk of infection or spread of a disease (such as HIV), the fact that not every
25 class member or even the named plaintiff contracted the disease would not preclude an injunction.
26 Every person, indeed not even a majority of the class, need not be infected with a life-threatening
27 disease before relief may be granted. The purpose of an injunction under Rule 23(b)(2), after all,
28 is to prevent future injury that may occur as a result of the complained of policy. *See Dittimus-
Bey v. Taylor*, 244 F.R.D. 284, 291 (D.N.J. 2007) (prison-crowding case in which the Court found
that “Rule 23 does not require that the representative plaintiff have endured precisely the same
injuries that have been sustained by the class members, only that the harm complained of be
common to the class, and that the named plaintiff demonstrate a personal interest or threat of
injury that is real and immediate, not conjectural or hypothetical”).

1 (emphasis added). *See Adamson v. Bowen*, 855 F.2d 668, 676 (10th Cir. 1988) (“That the claims
2 of individual class members may differ factually should not preclude certification under Rule
3 23(b)(2) of a claim seeking the application of a common policy.”); 7AA Charles Alan Wright et
4 al., *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1775 (3d ed. 1998) (“All the class members need not be
5 aggrieved by or desire to challenge defendant’s conduct in order for some of them to seek relief
6 under Rule 23(b)(2).”). As Professor Rubenstein explained:

7 The first requirement under Rule 23(b)(2) is that “the party opposing
8 the class has acted or refused to act on grounds that apply generally
9 to the class.” While the Rule looks for grounds that “apply
10 generally” to the class, it is well-settled that the defendant’s conduct
11 described in the complaint need not be directed or damaging to
12 every member of the class. The framers of the Rule stated that:
13 “Action or inaction is directed to a class within the meaning of this
14 subdivision even if it has taken effect or is threatened only as to one
15 or a few members of the class, provided it is based on grounds
16 which have general application to the class.”

17 Courts have followed the Advisory Committee’s approach, finding
18 that certification of a Rule 23(b)(2) class is proper despite the fact
19 that not all class members may have suffered the injury posed by the
20 class representatives so long as the challenged policy or practice was
21 generally applicable to the class as a whole. The requirement
22 focuses on the defendant and questions whether the defendant has a
23 policy that affects everyone in the proposed class in a similar
24 fashion. That scrutiny ensures that the class’s interests are related in
25 a manner that makes aggregate litigation appropriate -- because one
26 class member’s litigation will invariably affect everyone in the class
27 -- and therefore efficient.

28 William B. Rubenstein et al., *Newberg on Class Actions* § 4:28 (5th ed.) (citations omitted).¹⁷

17 Thus, rights of the class under Rule 23(b)(2) are not measured solely by the facts and
circumstances of the named representatives. For example, in reviewing mental health care
provided by the California prison system, the court in *Coleman v. Wilson* did not limit its factual
findings to the claims of the named plaintiffs; it considered the testimony of inmate witnesses and
declarations of expert witnesses, whose reports were based in part on interviews with numerous
inmates, unnamed members of the class. No. CIV S-90-0520 LKK JFM P, 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
20786, at *9-12, *23 at fn. 15 (E.D. Cal. June 6, 1994), *report and recommendation adopted as
modified by Coleman v. Wilson*, 912 F. Supp. 1282, 1324 (E.D. Cal. 1995). Similarly, in *Plata v.
Schwarzenegger*, the district court looked at the system as a whole, giving a “few representative
examples from the testimonial and documentary evidence” of the effects of inadequate health care
in the California prison system; evidence was not confined to the named plaintiffs. Case No. C01-
1351 TEH, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 43796, at *16-19 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2005); *see also Orantes-
Hernandez v. Meese*, 685 F. Supp. 1488, 1507 (C.D. Cal. 1988) (reviewing testimony from class
members, not just the named plaintiffs, to determine there was a procedural due process violation);
Perez-Funez v. Dist. Dir., I.N.S., 619 F. Supp. 656, 657, 661 (C.D. Cal. 1985) (reviewing the
testimony of both the named plaintiffs and fourteen other class members to determine whether
plaintiffs were signing a voluntary departure form without being advised of their rights). *Cf. Moss*

1 Accordingly, the Court finds that based on the record, there is substantial undisputed
2 evidence of prejudice suffered by the class as a whole based on conduct which applies generally to
3 the class; this is sufficient to satisfy the injury requirement for a procedural due process claim.

4 b. Legal Framework

5 Finding the injury requirement is satisfied starts but does not end the due process inquiry.
6 The Court must examine the merits of the constitutional claim, viewed in the context of a custodial
7 setting.

8 The parties dispute whether in reviewing Plaintiffs’ due process claim, the Court should
9 apply *Mathews v. Eldridge*’s balancing test or *Turner v. Safley*’s four-factor test. *Mathews*
10 requires that the court consider: (1) the interest at stake for the individual, (2) the risk of an
11 erroneous deprivation of the interest through the procedures used as well as the probable value of
12 additional or different procedural safeguards, and (3) the interest of the government in using the
13 current procedures rather than additional or different procedures. 424 U.S. 319, 224 (1976). In
14 contrast, *Turner* starts with the principle that “[a] prison regulation that impinges on an inmate’s
15 constitutional right ‘is valid if it is reasonably related to legitimate penological interests.’” *Valdez*
16 *v. Rosenbaum*, 302 F.3d 1039, 1048 (9th Cir. 2002) (quoting *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 89
17 (1987)). In determining reasonableness, the court must consider four factors: (1) whether there is
18 a “valid, rational connection” between the prison regulation and the legitimate governmental
19 interest put forward to justify it; (2) whether there are alternative means of exercising the right that
20 remain open to prison inmates; (3) whether accommodation of the asserted constitutional right will
21 have significant impacts on guards, other inmates, and the allocation of prison resources generally;
22 and (4) whether ready alternatives are absent (or whether obvious, easy alternatives exist).
23 *Turner*, 482 U.S. at 89-90.

24 *Mathews* and *Turner* are not mutually exclusive; the application of one test does not

26 *v. Lane*, 471 F.2d 853, 854-55 (4th Cir. 1973) (rejecting trial court’s conclusion that because the
27 plaintiff had not proved his discrimination case, the class action also failed because “the
28 subsequent dismissal or mootness of his individual claim . . . will not operate as a dismissal or
render moot the action of the class, or destroy the plaintiff’s right to litigate the issues on behalf of
the class.”).

1 prohibit the use of the other. Instead, the Court finds that in the instant case, application of both
2 *Mathews* and *Turner* is necessary. As a predicate to applying the *Turner* four-factor test, the
3 Court must first find that there is a prison regulation that “*impinges on inmates’ constitutional*
4 *rights.*” *Turner*, 482 U.S. at 89 (emphasis added). If there is no such impingement, then the Court
5 need not reach the *Turner* four-factor test. The Court must therefore first apply the *Mathews*
6 balancing test in order to determine if Plaintiffs’ due process rights have been impinged by the
7 telephone restrictions at issue. If the Court finds that Plaintiffs’ constitutional rights have been
8 impinged, the Court will then apply the *Turner* four-factor test.

9 Plaintiffs contend *Turner* has no application to the case at bar. In *Demery v. Arpaio*, the
10 Ninth Circuit declined to apply *Turner* in an action alleging violations of substantive due process
11 based on the installation of live-streaming webcams in a prison facility used exclusively to house
12 pretrial detainees. 378 F.3d 1020, 1024 (9th Cir. 2004). The court found that *Turner* was
13 inapposite because: (1) “*Turner* dealt with convicted prisoners, not pretrial detainees,” and (2)
14 “*Turner* involved an Eighth Amendment cruel and unusual punishment challenge, not a claim
15 brought under the Substantive Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.” *Id.* at 1028-
16 29. However, although the Ninth Circuit has not expressly overruled *Demery*, the Ninth Circuit
17 has since applied the *Turner* four-factor test to pre-trial detainees. *Pierce v. Cnty. of Orange*, 526
18 F.3d 1190, 1209 (9th Cir. 2008); *see also Bull v. City & Cnty. of S.F.*, 595 F.3d 964, 974 n.10 (9th
19 Cir. 2010) (en banc) (“We have never distinguished between pretrial detainees and prisoners in
20 applying the *Turner* test, but have identified the interests of correction facility officials responsible
21 for pretrial detainees as being ‘penological’ in nature. [Citations] While penological interests in
22 punishment or rehabilitation may not be applicable outside of a prison setting, the penological
23 interest in security and safety is applicable in all correction facilities.”); *United States v. Loughner*,
24 672 F.3d 731, 751 (9th Cir. 2012) (“So long as Loughner is a pretrial detainee, and lawfully held,
25 his rights are limited by the facility’s legitimate goals and policies, and his dangerousness to
26 himself or to others may be judged by the same standard as convicted detainees.”). The Ninth
27 Circuit has further acknowledged that the Supreme Court has ““made quite clear that the standard
28 of review [in *Turner*] applies to all circumstances in which the needs of prison administration

1 implicate constitutional rights.” *Bull*, 595 F.3d at 974 (quoting *Washington v. Harper*, 494 U.S.
2 210, 224 (1990)); *see also Washington*, 494 U.S. at 224 (principles articulated in *Turner* “apply in
3 all cases in which a prisoner asserts that a prison regulation violates the Constitution, not just those
4 in which the prisoner invokes the First Amendment.”).

5 The Court thus finds that the appropriate legal framework is to first apply the *Mathews*
6 balancing test to determine if the complained of phone restrictions would result in a putative
7 constitutional violation. If it does, the Court must apply *Turner* to determine whether the phone
8 restrictions which impinges upon due process rights nonetheless may be upheld because they are
9 “reasonably related to legitimate penological interests.”¹⁸ 482 U.S. at 89.

10 c. Application

11 i. *Mathews* and Constitutional Violation

12 The threshold question is whether the complained of regulations violate detainees’

13
14 ¹⁸ Plaintiffs contend, however, that they are unaware of any cases that have applied *Turner*
15 deference to detention conditions of civil detainees who alleged that their conditions impacted
16 procedural rights in pending civil proceedings. Docket No. 160 (Plaintiffs Supp.) at 1 fn. 1. As
17 discussed above, the Supreme Court has taken a broad view that *Turner* should apply to all
18 circumstances in which the needs of prison administration implicate constitutional rights, and that
19 *Turner* is a recognition of “the need to reconcile our longstanding adherence to the principle that
20 inmates retain at least some constitutional rights despite incarceration with the recognition that
21 prison authorities are best equipped to make difficult decisions regarding prison administration.”
22 *Washington*, 494 U.S. at 223-24. The Supreme Court has long recognized the government’s
23 interest in “manag[ing] the facility in which the individual is detained For example, the
24 Government must be able to take steps to maintain security and order at the institution and make
25 certain no weapons or illicit drugs reach detainees.” *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 540 (1979); *see*
26 *also Turner*, 482 U.S. at 84-85 (“Running a prison is an inordinately difficult undertaking that
27 requires expertise, planning, and the commitment of resources, all of which are peculiarly within
28 the province of the legislative and executive branches of government. Prison administration is,
moreover, a task that has been committed to the responsibility of these branches, and separation of
powers concerns counsel a policy of judicial restraint.”). In order to give the necessary deference
to the government’s interests in institutional order and security, the Court will apply the *Turner*
four-factor test. *Compare with Flemings v. Gray*, 1:14-cv-01248 LJO DLB PC, 2015 U.S. Dist.
LEXIS 93433, at *9 (E.D. Cal. July 17, 2015) (reviewing claim for deprivation of property
without procedural due process and finding that “[a]uthorized deprivations of property are
permissible if carried out pursuant to a regulation that is reasonably related to a legitimate
penological interest); *Casper v. Baker*, 3:12-cv-00204-LRH-VPC, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 183058,
at *31 (D. Nev. Aug. 23, 2013), *report and recommendation adopted by Casper v. Baker*, 2014
U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3108 (D. Nev. Jan. 10, 2014) (same); *Patrick v. Bonner Cnty. Sheriff’s Dep’t*,
Case No. 2:11-cv-00113-EJL-REB, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84027, at * (D. Idaho June 13, 2013)
(same); *Dudley v. Cesolini*, No. CV 11-0387-PHK-SMM (LOSA), 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
190818, at *15 (D. Ariz. May 11, 2012) (same).

1 constitutional rights, in this case their due process right to a full and fair hearing and access to
2 counsel. *See* Compl. at ¶¶ 100-109. Again, *Mathews* requires that the court consider three factors:
3 (1) the interest at stake for the individual, (2) the risk of an erroneous deprivation of the interest
4 through the procedures used as well as the probable value of additional or different procedural
5 safeguards, and (3) the interest of the government in using the current procedures rather than
6 additional or different procedures. 424 U.S. at 224.

7 The Ninth Circuit has found that “conclusions regarding the due process . . . claims present
8 mixed questions of law and fact since they involve a determination of whether factual findings
9 satisfy undisputed rules of law.” *Nat’l Ass’n of Radiation Survivors v. Derwinski*, 994 F.2d 583,
10 587 (1992) (applying *Mathews* to due process claim). In particular, when there are factual
11 disputes underlying legal determinations, such questions must be resolved by the factfinder. *See*
12 *Wheaton v. Webb-Petett*, 931 F.2d 613, 617 (9th Cir. 1991) (remanding plaintiff’s due process
13 claim because the plaintiff “has raised genuine factual issues on whether his constitutional right to
14 pretermination process was respected”).

15 (a) Plaintiffs’ Interests

16 The parties do not appear to seriously dispute that Plaintiffs have a significant interest in
17 avoiding deportation, the ultimate consequence and hence interest at stake. In applying *Mathews*
18 in the immigration context, the Ninth Circuit has found that “[i]t is clear that the plaintiffs’
19 interests in this case are significant.” *Walters*, 145 F.3d at 1043 (citing *Landon v. Plasencia*, 459
20 U.S. 21, 34 (1982) (alien’s interest in deportation proceedings “is, without question, a weighty
21 one” because “[s]he stands to lose the right to stay and live in this land of freedom [and] may lose
22 the right to rejoin her immediate family, a right that ranks high among the interests of the
23 individual.”)). Thus, the Court finds that Plaintiffs have a significant interest.

24 (b) Risk of Erroneous Deprivation of Rights

25 Plaintiffs next argue that the telephone restrictions create a risk of depriving Plaintiffs of
26 their rights because they “effectively den[y] Plaintiffs a means of accessing the counsel and
27 evidence needed to present their cases.” Plaintiffs Mot. at 30. However, as to this factor, the
28 Court finds that there are numerous factual disputes that make summary judgment on this issue

1 inappropriate at this time. First, there are outstanding disputes at each of the facilities as to the
2 adequacy of the private phone options at each of the Facilities. Specifically, the parties dispute
3 whether detainee calls are limited to attorneys only at both Contra Costa and Mesa Verde, the
4 availability of phone rooms at Contra Costa, and whether RCCC and Yuba’s private phone options
5 are in fact private. The availability of private phone options can affect detainees in a number of
6 ways; for example, detainees have testified that their inability to communicate with their attorneys
7 was specifically the result of the lack of privacy, especially when the case involves sensitive
8 personal information that could lead to physical harm. *E.g.*, Docket No. 120-12 (I.P. Dec.) at ¶¶
9 36-38 (RCCC detainee explaining difficulty in communicating with his attorney due to lack of
10 privacy because his case involved sensitive personal information concerning his sexual
11 orientation, and did not want his sexuality known in a jail setting due to fear of harm from other
12 detainees or deputies); H.S. Dec. at ¶ 15 (RCCC detainee explaining difficulty using non-private
13 phones to discuss his case with his attorneys as his claim was based on his sexual orientation, and
14 had previously been harassed and physically attacked because of his sexual orientation). There is
15 also evidence that limiting the private phones to attorney calls only – another factual issue in
16 dispute – can impede individuals from gathering evidence, particularly individuals who have no
17 attorney or when the private phone is the only available phone option without a positive
18 acceptance requirement. *See* Lyon Dec. at ¶ 8 (Contra Costa detainee explaining inability to call
19 the East Palo Alto Police Department to obtain a police report he needed for his U-visa application
20 because the department did not accept collect calls); Docket No. 120-8 (M.G. Dec.) at ¶ 13
21 (RCCC detainee explaining inability to call extended family members, Fresno Police Department,
22 and corroborating witness to gather evidence for his U-visa case); Docket No. 120-6 (O.A. Dec.)
23 at ¶ 14 (Yuba detainee explaining inability to contact gang prevention program for evidence likely
24 because the program did not want to accept a call from an unspecified inmate at Yuba County
25 Jail); Docket No. 120-5 (R.K. Dec.) at ¶¶ 19-20 (Contra Costa detainee explaining inability to call
26 contacts at the Marin County Probation Department and Health and Human Services Department
27 for support in bond hearing because they would not accept a collect call). These disputes over the
28 actual availability of private phone options may affect the due process analysis.

1 The Court also finds that the record on notice is not fully developed. For example, during
2 the hearing on this matter, the parties debated whether Plaintiffs had demonstrated any harm based
3 on the ban on three-way calling. Docket No. 157 at 38:20-14. Defendants argued that Plaintiffs
4 had failed to “point[] to any facts where the request was made to make a three-way call to use an
5 interpreter for legal purposes,” to which Plaintiffs responded that detainees are informed by
6 policies and handbooks that three-way calling is prohibited, and thus would not think that is an
7 available option to request. *Id.*; *see also id.* at 47:4-14 (Defendants argument that there is no
8 evidence detainees asked to use the private phones to connect with counsel who were not on the
9 pro bono platform, to which Plaintiffs responded that many detainees did not even know there was
10 a private phone option until informed by other detainees or an ACLU lawyer). In short, even
11 assuming that these options are available (which was not clear from the record), if detainees are
12 not informed of the availability and are even given legitimate reasons to believe that they are not
13 available (whether by wrong information being stated in detainee handbooks, postings, or staff), it
14 may be difficult for Defendants to argue that there is no evidence of harm simply because no
15 detainee has ever asked for an accommodation that they were explicitly told was prohibited.

16 Because there are outstanding factual disputes which may materially affect whether there is
17 a risk of erroneous deprivation, the Court finds that summary judgment is not appropriate at this
18 time.

19 (c) Government Interest

20 Finally, the Court must consider the government’s interest in using the current procedures
21 rather than additional or different safeguards. The Supreme Court has recognized that “[t]he
22 government’s interest in efficient administration of the immigration laws at the border also is
23 weighty.” *Landon*, 459 U.S. at 34. It has also found that “[t]he Government also has legitimate
24 interests that stem from its need to manage the facility in which the individual is detained For
25 example, the Government must be able to take steps to maintain security and order at the
26 institution and make certain no weapons or illicit drugs reach detainees.” *Bell*, 441 U.S. at 540.
27 Furthermore, “[s]triking a balance between these two strong competing interests cannot be done in
28 the abstract.” *Al Haramain Islamic Found., Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of Treasury*, 686 F.3d 965, 980 (9th

1 Cir. 2012). The Court must “carefully assess the precise ‘procedures used’ by the government,
2 ‘the value of additional safeguards,’ and ‘the burdens of additional procedural requirements.’” *Id.*

3 The Court finds that there are a number of outstanding disputes with respect to the
4 government’s interest. For example, there is an issue regarding the calling rates. Defendants do
5 not appear to provide any justification for the rates, instead arguing that they are irrelevant given
6 the FCC’s regulations. Defendants Mot. at 13. Defendants argued that issues regarding cost “will
7 soon be largely irrelevant . . . because the Federal Communications Commission (‘FCC’) has
8 undertaken regulation of inmate and detainee calling, which would impose caps on interstate and
9 intrastate calling rates and eliminate connection fees. Defendants Mot. at 13; FCC, 15-136, Rates
10 for Interstate Inmate Calling Services, at ¶¶ 22, 101, *available at*
11 http://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-15-136A1.pdf (last accessed Feb. 2, 2016);
12 Docket No. 120-24, Exh. A (Wood Report) at 12 (table of rate caps). Plaintiffs’ expert, Mr.
13 Wood, agreed that “the recent action by the FCC . . . represents a useful tool that will help ensure
14 reasonable rates for ICS [Inmate Calling Services].” Wood Report at 12. The rules and
15 requirements governing rates and connection fees were to be made effective on June 20, 2016.
16 Defendants Reply at 7 n.10; FCC, WC Docket No. 12-375, Wireline Competition Bureau
17 Announces the Comment Cycle and Effective Dates for the *Inmate Calling Second Report and*
18 *Order and Third FNPRM*, at 2, *available at* [http://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-15-](http://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-15-1484A1.pdf)
19 [1484A1.pdf](http://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-15-1484A1.pdf) (last accessed Feb. 2, 2016). However, given the D.C. Circuit’s decision staying
20 implementation of the FCC regulations, this issue will need to be fully developed to determine
21 what, if any, government interest exists for justifying the phone costs. *See* Docket No. 161-1
22 (order staying FCC, 15-136).

23 With respect to the automatic cutoffs at Contra Costa, Defendants argue that time limits on
24 call duration promote safety and security by reducing the possibility of fights for telephone access
25 while promoting equitable access to phones. Defendants Mot. at 15. Yet Plaintiffs have presented
26 evidence showing that Contra Costa’s officials were unable to explain why there is a cutoff on the
27 Talton Free Call Platform, and stated that the cutoff “doesn’t make any sense.” Ha Dec., Exh. 37
28 (Grant Dep.) at 77:4-18. Plaintiffs further argue that short cut-offs are also not applied across-the-

1 board; for example, Mesa Verde has a 180-minute limitation, which is only in place to prevent
2 people from forgetting to hang up the phone. Docket Yee-Garcia Dec., Exh. 60 (Talton Dep.) at
3 155:11-19 (explaining that the security precaution for the 180-minute limit is so that detainees
4 “can’t leave the phone off the hook. You know, after they get on the phone, they just drop the
5 phone. Let’s say they walk away, and the next day, you know, the clock is still ticking, you know.
6 So in other words, the call has to end at some point.”). It is unclear whether there is sufficient
7 justification where the limitations appear to vary widely. Given that all reasonable inferences
8 must be drawn against the non-moving party, summary judgment is not appropriate.

9 There is also a dispute as to whether there is any government interest in Contra Costa’s
10 requirement that Housing Unit Phones be paid for by the recipient, which has affected the ability
11 of detainees to obtain information if the recipient is not willing (or able) to pay for the call, even if
12 the detainee is willing to pay for the call. Defendants only explain that Contra Costa doesn’t have
13 the ability to assign a pin number to the detainees, but is “currently exploring obtaining a new jail
14 management system.” Defendants Mot. at 15. It is not clear that this is a legitimate governmental
15 purpose, but Defendants at this juncture is entitled to the benefit of reasonable inferences.

16 Similarly, it is unclear whether the time restrictions on when detainees can access phones
17 are reasonably related to a government interest, particularly with respect to Contra Costa.
18 Defendants argue they have an interest in limited hours to ensure that violent or unruly individuals
19 are segregated, or to protect individuals from other detainees who may harm them. However, the
20 applicability of this policy to the Facilities raises some questions; as Plaintiffs point out, Contra
21 Costa imposes the greatest time restrictions on detainees use of their Housing Unit Phones (with
22 only 1.5 hours during regular business hours); yet Contra Costa has the lowest percentage of
23 medium-high and high risk prisoners. Plaintiffs Opp. at 14; *see* Shinnars Dec., Exh. 32. The
24 record on this point is sparse.

25 Finally, there is an overarching question of whether application of the ICE’s 2011
26 Performance Based National Detention Standards (2011 PBNDS) could be readily implemented, a
27 question which goes to whether the government has an interest in using the current procedures
28 rather than additional or different procedures. *See* U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement,

1 Performance-Based National Detention Standards 2011, *available at*
2 <https://www.ice.gov/detention-standards/2011> (last accessed Feb. 5, 2016). Currently, RCCC,
3 Yuba, and Contra Costa must comply with ICE’s 2000 National Detention Standards (2000 NDS),
4 while Mesa Verde must comply with the 2011 PBNDS. Plaintiffs Mot. at 18; Hackett Report at ¶
5 5. Plaintiffs argue that the 2011 PBNDS “require many of the outcomes Plaintiffs seek in this
6 litigation.” *Id.* at 19. This includes reasonably priced telephone calls (2011 PBNDS at §
7 5.6.V.A.2); providing direct or free calls to offices, including federal and state courts, legal
8 representatives, legal services, and government offices to obtain relevant documents (2011
9 PBNDS at § 5.6.V.E); providing private legal calls (2011 PBNDS at § 5.6.V.F.2); allowing
10 incoming legal calls and messages (2011 PBNDS at § 5.6.V.J); and providing adequate notice of
11 telephone access opportunities, including in other languages (2011 PBNDS at § 5.6.V.C).
12 Plaintiffs’ expert, Mr. Berg, explains that while the 2000 NDS and 2011 PBNDS both “require
13 reasonable and equitable access to telephones and prohibit facilities from unduly limiting a
14 detainee’s efforts to obtain legal representation, the newer standards are significantly more
15 detailed, which makes expectations for detention facilities more clear.” Berg Report at 20. Thus,
16 the 2011 PBNDS are “generally more rigorous than the 2000 NDS because ICE recognized that
17 there were opportunities for improvement and best practices had evolved since the issuance of the
18 2000 NDS.” *Id.* at 20 (citation omitted).

19 However, the parties’ experts dispute whether the 2011 PBNDS can be readily
20 implemented. For example, Plaintiffs’ expert opines that the fiscal and administrative costs to
21 adopt better procedures, such as the 2011 PBNDS, and hire additional staff would be minimal.
22 Berg Report at 26-29. Mr. Berg takes the daily income of the RCCC, Contra Costa, and Yuba
23 facilities for housing ICE detainees, and compares it with the average starting annual salary for a
24 correctional officer for these counties. *Id.* at 28. Based on these numbers, Mr. Berg contends that
25 it will take RCCC 4.3 contract days to pay for one correctional officer, Contra Costa 3.6 contract
26 days to pay for one correctional officer, and Yuba 2.7 days to pay for one correctional officer.
27 Defendants’ expert, Mr. Hackett, counters that Mr. Berg’s calculations ignore the costs of jail
28 operations and employee costs beyond base salary, such as benefits, recruitment, and training.

1 Hackett Report at ¶ 34. Mr. Hackett also argues that implementation of the 2011 PBNDS is
2 affected by factors other than cost, such as facility construction, geographic location, and staffing
3 limitations. *Id.* at ¶ 33.

4 There are disputes of material fact in the record as to the government’s interest. This
5 together with the requirement that all reasonable inferences must be drawn against the moving
6 party where the record is inconclusive requires the summary judgment be denied. Moreover,
7 application of the *Mathews* balancing test is a mixed question of law and fact which is normally
8 for the trier of fact to decide. *See Nat’l Ass’n of Radiation Survivors*, 994 F.2d at 587.

9 ii. Turner “Rationally Related to a Legitimate Penological Objective”

10 In addition to the dispute over the application of *Mathews*, there are disputes as to whether
11 Defendants could satisfy the four-factor *Turner* test.¹⁹ Like the *Mathews* balancing test, the Ninth
12 Circuit has found that the *Turner* four factor test is a mixed question of law and fact. *See*
13 *Friedman v. Arizona*, 912 F.2d 328, 331 (9th Cir. 1990), *superseded by statute on other grounds*
14 (finding that whether a particular regulation “impermissibly restricts [the plaintiffs’] first
15 amendment right is a mixed question of law and fact” and applying *Turner*). However, “[t]he
16 legitimacy of prison officials’ asserted penological interests are findings of fact. *Henderson v.*
17 *Terhune*, 379 F.3d 709, 712 (9th Cir. 2004); *see also Cal. First Amend. Coal. v. Woodford*, 299
18 F.3d 868, 880 (9th Cir. 2002) (finding that the district court’s findings on whether there was a
19 ready alternative to the challenged procedure under *Turner* constituted factual findings).

20 In *Hrdlicka v. Reniff*, the Ninth Circuit overturned the district court’s grant of summary
21 judgment, finding that there were “questions of material facts” as to the district court’s application
22 of *Turner*. 631 F.3d 1044, 1046 (9th Cir. 2011). There, the publisher of the magazine “Crime,
23 Justice & America” (CJA) brought suit against two county jails that refused to distribute
24 unsolicited copies of CJA to its inmates, alleging First Amendment violations. *Id.* After
25 recognizing the existence of a First Amendment interest, the Ninth Circuit looked at each of the
26

27 ¹⁹ This is unsurprising, given that neither party briefed how *Turner* would apply in practice to the
28 instant case, as Defendants did not raise the issue until after briefing was completed.

1 *Turner* factors.

2 The first *Turner* factor, which requires a “valid, rational connection” between the prison
3 regulation and the government interest, “is a *sine qua non*: If the prison fails to show that the
4 regulation is rationally related to a legitimate penological objective, we do not consider the other
5 factors.” *Id.* at 1051 (internal quotation omitted). The Ninth Circuit looked at each of the
6 justifications forwarded by the county jails. First, the jails asserted that refusing to distribute
7 unsolicited copies of CJA promoted jail security by reducing the likelihood of contraband entering
8 the jail and the amount of clutter (thereby reducing the risk of fires and promoting efficient cell
9 searches). While the Ninth Circuit did not question the importance of these goals, it found that the
10 defendant’s general statements were “undercut by the specific evidence they offer in an attempt to
11 show the degree to which these purposes are actually served by a refusal to allow the requested
12 distribution of CJA.” *Id.* The Ninth Circuit pointed to one of the jail’s decision to stop
13 distributing unsolicited copies of newspapers, noting that the decision was based on the monetary
14 cost and not security risks. *Id.* It also found that the other prison had admitted that inmates had
15 access to paper that they could use for improper purpose, and that there was no specific evidence
16 that distribution of CJA would increase the rate of misuse of paper. *Id.* at 1052. Second, the jails
17 asserted that allowing delivery of unsolicited copies of CJA would require additional staff time.
18 The Ninth Circuit rejected this as well, as there was no estimate of how many additional personnel
19 hours would be required for CJA to be delivered. Furthermore, neither jail had suggested that
20 unsolicited publications were more difficult to inspect than solicited publications. *Id.* at 1053.
21 Third, one of the jails argued that accepting unsolicited CJA would create a “slippery slope” that
22 would require the jail to accept other unsolicited publications. *Id.* However, the Ninth Circuit
23 pointed out that this “slippery slope” problem was not a concern when the jail accepted or ceased
24 accepting unsolicited copies of newspapers, and that there had only been three requests to
25 distribute unsolicited publications. *Id.* Finally, one of the jails contended that it had an interest in
26 maintaining control over advertising of bail in the jail, as the jail had an existing contract with an
27 organization to operate bulletin boards on which bail bond agents could post advertisements. *Id.*
28 The Ninth Circuit found that it was not clear how distribution of CJA would be inconsistent with

1 that contract, and that in any case, there was no legitimate penological interest “in protecting a
2 profit made by impinging on inmates’ First Amendment rights.” *Id.*

3 The Ninth Circuit then reviewed the second *Turner* factor, which looked at whether other
4 avenues are available for the exercise of the asserted right. *Id.* Although the jails argued that CJA
5 could still be distributed to inmates who request it, “there is a material question of fact whether, as
6 a practical matter, Plaintiffs can effectively reach county jail inmates if they can delivery CJA only
7 upon request.” *Id.* at 1054. Specifically, the Ninth Circuit noted that it is difficult to create broad
8 awareness of CJA when inmate populations turn over quickly, resulting in many inmates having
9 left the jail before they could learn about CJA’s existence, request it to be sent, and then receive it.
10 *Id.*

11 The Ninth Circuit also found “material questions of fact” as to the third *Turner* factor,
12 which looks at the impact accommodation of the asserted constitutional right will have on guards
13 and other inmates. *Id.* Specifically, the Ninth Circuit explained that there were questions about
14 “whether, and to what degree, the jails should be forced to expend significant additional resources
15 if CJA was delivered by either of the two methods sought by Plaintiffs.” *Id.* For example, the
16 publisher had proposed delivering only one copy of CJA for every ten inmates each week, and
17 offered to either do a general delivery or individually addressed mailings. *Id.* The jails, in turn,
18 had not explained how mail inspectors would distinguish between a copy of CJA that is solicited
19 and that is not, or why a complete ban on unsolicited mail did not consume more prison resources
20 than accepting such mail if the jail had to compile subscription lists and compare incoming mail to
21 those lists. *Id.*

22 Finally, the Ninth Circuit analyzed the fourth *Turner* factor, which looked at whether there
23 was the existence of easy and obvious alternatives which would indicate that the challenged
24 regulation is an exaggerated response by prison officials. *Id.* ““This is not a “least restrictive
25 alternative” test: prison officials do not have to set up and then shoot down every conceivable
26 alternative method of accommodating the claimant’s constitutional complaint.”” *Id.* at 1054-55
27 (quoting *Turner*, 482 U.S. at 90-91). However, an alternative that fully accommodates the
28 asserted rights at *de minimis* cost suggests that the regulation does not satisfy the reasonable

1 relationship standard. *Id.* at 1055. As applied in *Hrdlicka*, the Ninth Circuit found that it was
2 undisputed that CJA was distributed in more than 60 countries throughout 13 states, including 32
3 California county jails, thus “suggest[ing] that the response of the two jails in this case may be
4 exaggerated.” *Id.* Further, the “weak, and to some degree contradictory, specific evidence”
5 offered by the jails in support of their cited penological purposes suggested that the challenged
6 policies were an exaggerated response. *Id.* Taken together, the Ninth Circuit concluded that the
7 jails were not entitled to summary judgment.

8 In the instant case, the parties raise similar questions as to whether the asserted regulations
9 are reasonably related to the penological purposes being asserted by Defendants. In general, the
10 Supreme Court has recognized that the government has legitimate interests in managing detention
11 facilities, including the maintenance of security and order at the institution. *See Bell*, 441 U.S. at
12 540. There is also evidence that the government has an interest in controlling phone use in
13 particular, including to prevent inmates from making threatening or harmful calls to the
14 community. *Shinners Dec.*, Exh. 33 (Berg Dep.) at 46:23-47:18, 50:14-20, 122:11-17; *see also*
15 *generally* *Shinners Dec.*, Exh. 34 (Hackett Report).

16 However, as discussed above, there are several disputes as to specific justifications made
17 by Defendants for various technical limitations, such as whether there is a penological interest in
18 the time limits, Contra Costa’s requirement that calls made from Housing Unit Phones be paid for
19 by a recipient, and time restrictions on when detainees can access phones. There is also a
20 significant question as to whether the 2011 PBNDS can be readily implemented, a question which
21 goes to whether Defendants’ telephone policies are an “exaggerated response” where there is an
22 obvious alternative. Viewed as a whole, the Court finds that there are disputes of material fact
23 which make summary judgment improper in the instant case, particularly in view of the reasonable
24 inferences that must be drawn in the non-moving party’s favor along with the fact that application
25 of *Turner* is a mixed question of law and fact.

26 D. Right to Petition

27 Plaintiffs contend that per their right to petition the government for redress of grievances,
28 they have a right to obtain governmental records, benefits, or actions, as well as hire and consult

1 attorneys. Plaintiffs Mot. at 46. Defendants in turn contend that an application for immigrant
2 status is not a lawsuit or airing of a political grievance, but is an affirmative application for a
3 discretionary benefit from the government, which should not be considered a petition for redress
4 of grievances. Defendants Mot. at 36-37. However, the Ninth Circuit has found that “the First
5 Amendment extends to the right to petition an administrative agency” *Nat’l Ass’n of*
6 *Radiation Survivors*, 994 F.2d at 595 (concerning applications for Veterans’ Administration
7 benefits based on exposure to ionizing radiation during service). Given the stakes at issue in
8 removal proceedings, the Court sees no reason why the right to petition does not apply here. The
9 Court therefore finds that the petition clause can extend to the immigration proceedings which
10 Plaintiffs allege are impacted by telephone restrictions.

11 However, for the same reasons discussed with respect to Plaintiffs’ procedural due process
12 clause, the Court finds that summary judgment on Plaintiffs’ First Amendment claim is
13 inappropriate at this time. In *National Association of Radiation Survivors*, the Ninth Circuit found
14 that both the due process and First Amendment claims were about “meaningful access to the VA
15 benefits process,” such that “the focus of the First Amendment analysis is essentially the same as
16 that under the Due Process Clause.” 994 F.2d at 595. As the Ninth Circuit had already
17 determined that there was no due process violation, it summarily found that there was no First
18 Amendment violation. *Id.* As in *National Association of Radiation Survivors*, the focus of
19 Plaintiffs’ First Amendment claim is essentially the same as that under the due process clause, as
20 both claims are related to how telephone restrictions affect detainees’ ability to gather evidence to
21 present at their immigration hearing and to contact, retain, and consult with attorneys. *See* Compl.
22 at ¶¶ 103 (due process claim based on Defendants having “violated Plaintiffs’ right to
23 representation of counsel by denying and severely restricting Plaintiffs’ ability to make telephone
24 calls to locate, consult with, and retain counsel, and Plaintiffs’ ability to communicate with
25 retained counsel”); 108 (due process claim based on Defendants having “violated Plaintiffs’ right
26 to a full and fair hearing by denying and severely restricting Plaintiffs’ ability to make telephone
27 calls to gather information and obtain evidence in support of their immigration cases); 112 (First
28 Amendment claim based on Defendants having “violated Plaintiffs’ right to petition the

1 government by denying and severely restricting the telephone access necessary to seek legal
2 representation and obtain documents and evidence in support of their applications for immigration
3 benefits”). For the reasons the Court denies summary judgment on Plaintiffs’ procedural due
4 process claim, it denies summary judgment on the First Amendment claim.

5 **IV. CONCLUSION**

6 The Court **GRANTS** Defendants’ motion for summary judgment with respect to Plaintiffs’
7 INA statutory claims and substantive due process claims. Based on undisputed facts, the Court
8 finds Plaintiffs have satisfied the injury requirement for a procedural due process claim. However,
9 the Court **DENIES** the cross-motions for summary judgment with respect to Plaintiffs’ procedural
10 due process and First Amendment claims for the reasons stated above.


11 Having viewed the record, the Court observes that there do not appear to be many issues of
12 dispute with respect to present conditions in the Facilities. The primary factual disputes under the
13 *Mathews* analysis concern, as the Court noted, the availability of private phone options and how
14 much notice is provided to detainees about the available phone options. As to *Turner*, there are a
15 number of factual disputes and an inclusive record relative to the justification and penological
16 interests asserted by Defendants.

17 The Court thus **ORDERS** the parties to meet and confer, in order to reach a stipulation to
18 undisputed facts (as found and set forth in this Order) for trial and to determine which specific
19 facts need to be tried. Those areas should be limited in scope as indicated herein, and the evidence
20 for trial herein shall be so limited. The Court will also set a Case Management Conference for
21 March 23, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. to delineate the scope and nature of the trial.

22 This order disposes of Docket Nos. 120 and 139.

23
24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25
26 Dated: March 18, 2016

27 
28 _____
EDWARD M. CHEN
United States District Judge